JUL 27 1948

Anglican Theological Review



PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT and BURTON S. EASTON

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXX JULY, 1948 NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

Revolution—and Christian Response.....*Henry P. Van Dusen* 145

Trends in Old Testament Introductions from 1930 to the Present *John H. Scammon* 150

The Teacher.....*George Van Santvoord* 156

Order and Freedom: A Philosophical Approach (Church Congress Syllabus 51).....*John S. Marshall* 159

The Task of an Illusion.....*Mary E. Clarkson* 166

A Fresh Approach to Christology.....*Sherman E. Johnson* 170

Book Reviews..... 173

Notes on New Books..... 196

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

PRINCE AND LEMON STS.
LANCASTER, PENNSYLVANIA

$1.00 A NUMBER

$3.50 A YEAR

Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXX | JULY, 1948 | NUMBER 3

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., D.S.Litt., D.C.L., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: THE REV. BURTON SCOTT EASTON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, General Theological Seminary

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. HOLT HUTTON GRAHAM, M.A., Instructor in New Testament, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D.
PROF. FRANK W. BUCKLER, S.T.D.
PRES. GORDON KEITH CHALMERS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D.
RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D.
RT. REV. RICHARD S. M. EMRICH, Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES R. FEILDING, M.A.
REV. JOSEPH F. FLETCHER, S.T.D.
REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D.
REV. H. E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D.
REV. ROBERT MCQUEEN GRANT, Th.D.
RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D.
PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D.
REV. EDWARD R. HARDY, JR., Ph.D.
REV. LOUIS A. HASELMEYER, JR., Ph.D.
REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D.
REV. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, Ph.D.
REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D.
REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D.
REV. LEICESTER C. LEWIS, S.T.D., Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR., Ph.D.
PROF. JOHN S. MARSHALL, Ph.D.
RT. REV. FRANK A. MCELWAIN, D.D.
REV. DANIEL A. MCGREGOR, Ph.D.
REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D.
REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D.
REV. ARNOLD S. NASH, D.D.
RT. REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D.
REV. WILLIAM H. NES, D.D., D.C.L.
RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D.
REV. W. NORMAN PITTENGER, B.D.
REV. CYRIL C. RICHARDSON, Th.D.
REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D.
REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D.
REV. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., Ph.D.
RT. REV. HENRY KNOX SHERRILL, D.D.
REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D.
REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D.
REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D.
RT. REV. ROBERT E. L. STRIDER, D.D.
REV. JOHN W. SUTER, JR., D.D.
REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, JR., Th.D.
RT. REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, D.D.
RT. REV. H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, D.D.
REV. PERCY L. URBAN, S.T.D.
PROF. JOACHIM WACH, Ph.D.
REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D.
REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D.
REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D.

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut
THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC, Berkeley, California
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City
KENYON COLLEGE, Gambier, Ohio
NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin
TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut
TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, Sewanee, Tennessee
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia
SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: January, April, July, October. Subscription price $3.50 annually. Single copies, $1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. Holt H. Graham, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXX JULY, 1948 NUMBER 3

REVOLUTION—AND CHRISTIAN RESPONSE

By HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

Union Theological Seminary

I

The determinative characteristic of our day is that it is a revolutionary age. Revolutionary, not merely in the obvious sense that it is marked by widespread and far-reaching economic, social, and political revolutions; though that is true and important. But in the far profounder sense that we are witnessing the breakup of the underlying structures of "modern" culture. It is this disintegration which is itself a principal cause of social, political, and economic revolutions. The latter spring from the more fundamental cultural disintegration, and in turn aggravate it. In the West, it is the breakup of the relatively stable structures which have formed society since the period which began roughly with the Renaissance and the Reformation—the era of freedom in thought, individualism in personal practice, capitalism in economics, Protestantism in religion. In the East, it is the breakup of structures which have formed culture for much longer. It is sometimes loosely said today that we are living in the "post-Christian" era. That is a misstatement. But it may be said that we are moving into the "post-Modern" era. As has been often said, it is "the end of our time."

Only twice or at most thrice since Christianity came to birth has humanity passed through a revolution so fundamental and far-reaching. Christianity was born in such an age of revolution. The traditional patterns of life in the ancient world—communal, national, social and religious—were disintegrating, partly from internal decay, partly under impact by the massive but artificial cosmopolitanism of the Roman Empire. Again, toward the end of the Dark Ages, Western society moved from its unformed chaos toward new unities of thought and life; the outcome was the Christendom of the great Middle Ages. Once more, at the dawn of the Modern Era, the habitual stabilities of Mediaeval culture broke up, partly from internal sterility, partly under the impact of Renaissance learning, resurgent nationalism, and the earliest impulses of modern individualism and industrialism.

II

The inner and controlling forces of any revolutionary age are to be discovered in the *new movements* which have

the power to claim general and ardent loyalty from the masses of men. In what they promise is found the goal of restless longings which furnish the dynamics of the new age aborning. In the First Century, Christianity itself was such a movement. It satisfied men's deepest yearnings. In the Sixteenth Century, the desire for individual dignity, freedom from authority, and opportunity, linked to a rebirth of national self-consciousness, moved men; one only need read Luther's appeal to the masses and to the German nobility to discern how large a role these factors played in the birth of Protestantism.

Today, four mighty movements kindle and claim the passionate devotion of millions—one (Fascism) lately scotched but not dead; three others (Communism, Islam and political Romanism) the three most powerful rivals of evangelical Christian Faith in various parts of the world. With all their variety, indeed enmity, they are alike in underlying character. All are totalitarianisms, both in their conscription of the whole of life and in their ambition to dominate the whole world. Therefore, whatever their temporary alliances in the interest of immediate goals, they recognize their deeper irreconcilable antagonisms. All hold out before the masses the promise of gifts valued more highly than any now possessed or promised by the dying society. What are those promises? Mainly three: personal security, social justice, and self-fulfillment through participation in shaping a communal destiny.

III

The authentic Christian response to Revolution is always *Reformation.* That Reformation is always bi-focal, or, if you prefer, two-faced. In part it is a movement of spiritual revitalization. In part, it is a movement of human emancipation. Revival *and* reform—these are its twin features, and often its two watchwords. Its first face, *revival,* is essentially unchanging in each successive epoch of revolution. The springs of spiritual rebirth are not new; they are always the same. They are loosed by return to the original source, through rediscovery of the Bible and reappropriation of the original Faith. But revival in itself has no power profoundly to mould the titanic forces released by disintegration, or to claim the devotion of those who guide those forces, unless it is directly and immediately relevant to the special character of each particular revolutionary era. The second face, *reform,* is different for each time of revolution, and must be determined by the latter's special character. It must understand, claim, and direct the same elemental impulses which respond to the dynamic secular movements of the time.

However, these deep, controlling features of the age exert a double influence on Christian Reformation. They inevitably, rightly determine the specific emphases and objectives of the Reformation. But, because they are not themselves wholly pure but embrace the illegitimate desires as well as the legitimate yearnings of the time—that is, are demonic—they always threaten Christian Reformation with infection by their vices.

As we look back upon the First Age of Christianity, we see clearly the marks which were essential in any faith which was to claim widespread response in that day. In an age characterized by the

disintegration of old securities and loyalties, by the superimposition of an artificial and shallow universalism and cosmopolitanism, it had to be a faith which promised release from fear and frustration, moral power, a universal gospel, assurance of immortality, and profound and sustaining communal fellowship. Precisely these, Christianity offered and bestowed. But Christianity early became infected with the vices of that time—preoccupation with mystical redemption rather than moral regeneration, magical rather than spiritual employment of its sacraments, massive ecclesiastical structure, too ready reading of its Faith in terms of the prevailing philosophies.

We see this two-fold influence of the spirit of revolution upon Christian Reformation even more clearly at the birth of the Modern Era. Protestantism responded to the yearning for personal dignity, opportunity and freedom, and satisfied them. But it was also gravely infected by the resurgent nationalism, exaggerated individualism and this-worldly concerns of the time. Modern Protestantism, in both its strength and weakness, resulted. Its strength sprang from profound spiritual revival, but revival vitally relevant to the needs and aspirations of the age. Its weaknesses flowed from uncritical acceptance of the false desires which motivated the masses.

IV

This analysis enables us better to understand our task today. We live in an age of revolution. The Church's true response is reformation. That reformation must be two-sided. It must be a movement of revival. It must be a movement of reform. Revival—that is, profound spiritual revitalization, through return to the old, ever-potent, never-exhausted source-springs, through recovery of the original Faith. There is nothing novel in all this. There never has been in any age of the Church's revitalization. Its power-house is in the Bible, whether, as in the Sixteenth Century through return to Paul and rediscovery of his gospel, or as in the Nineteenth Century—the latest great revitalization of the Church and the greatest of all in its practical fruitage, the parent of the modern missionary movement and of the early impulses of Christian social reform—through return to Jesus Himself and rediscovery of His Gospel.

But revival, if it is to claim the allegiance of the many and meet significantly the needs of this day, must be partnered by reform. This is essential, and this is perilous. It is essential because the unchanging Faith *must* be made relevant to *this* revolution. It is perilous because it is shadowed by danger of infection from the aberrations of this age. Authentic Christianity identifies itself wholly with the needs of men. It sympathizes profoundly with the demands of men. But it must understand the demonic as well as the creative impulses of the time.

V

What are the implications for our message and our task?

At every point they must be bi-focal, two-sided. They must be oriented to men's spiritual emptiness and to their human aspirations; they must seek both *revival* and *reform*. *Revival*—the same yesterday, today, always. *Reform*—immediate, contemporary, revolutionary.

Let me suggest five aspects of our task:

(1) *Interpretation.* As at the beginning, Christians must *outthink* as well as outlive and outlove the rivals of their Faith for the loyalty of men. We must be able to offer them a truer because profounder interpretation both of the yearning of their own souls and of the agony of their society.

(2) *Proclamation. Both* the "old, old story"—the answer to men's spiritual poverty, *and* a quite new, contemporary message—the answer to their world's fumbling quest for new structures.

(3) *Identification,* both with men's spiritual longing, and with their clamant aspirations, for security, for a larger social justice, for sustaining communal fellowship. More particularly, there must be rekindled sympathy with the needs and aspirations of this generation. This is not simply matching the promises of rivals, notably Communism; it is a recovery of our own authentic message. Its occasion may be the challenge of their gospel. But its source is not there, but in our own Gospel. Its proximate source is in the profound social concern and message of the Christian social reformers of the mid-Nineteenth Century who were contemporaries when they were not precursors of Karl Marx, and the exponents of the early Twentieth Century social gospel. Its ultimate source is in the compassion and intention of Jesus who so identified Himself in both speech and life, the source which the early Christian social reformers recovered and which empowered their and every true Christian Reformation. The hour is striking when the radical if gradual reordering of society which they preached and forecast is to achieve realization. The great question is: will it be under Christian or pagan direction?

(4) *Transformation,* both of individual souls, and of their communal life.

(5) *Demonstration.* As always, the major medium of the message is not proclamation but incarnation. Demonstration in personal life will be the fruit of true revival. But demonstration in corporate life is also the function and mission of the Church. Here is where effort to reproduce previous Christian Reformations, notably that of the Sixteenth Century, leads astray. Then, the great yearning of men was for individual freedom and self-expression. Today, "freedom" is the slogan of intellectuals and traditionalists. It is not the cry of the masses or of the movements which conscript their allegiance. The latter promise values more elemental than freedom—security and justice, and especially self-fulfillment through communal fellowships and loyalties and through participation in the determination of corporate destiny.

Here is a special challenge to the Church—the recovery of *Koinonia.* Not merely in each community, in the congregation. Ours is a global age of mass movements and a common destiny. It is *World Community, global koinonia,* which is the ultimate if far-off goal. It can never be more than most imperfectly realized. But it *can* be suggested. Yes, and anticipated—in living Christian communities of whatever size or scope which are truly ecumencial, in which there are Jews and Greeks, bond and free, male and female, Oriental and Occidental, Younger and Older Churches. The demand upon Christ's Church in our day is *Ecumenical* Reformation—demonstration in actuality of world-wide, Christian unity.

Bishop Edward L. Parsons, in an unpublished memorandum on the significance of the World Council of Churches, has recently written to much the same effect:

"The significance of the World Council for the Church and for the World includes one factor which has been hinted but not emphasised as it should be—the relation of the Ecumenical Movement and therefore of the World Council to the whole social order. The Protestant Reformation was the recovery for the Church of certain values which, if not forgotten, had been pushed into the background during the Middle Ages. The Ecumenical Movement is the recovery of values pushed into the background during the centuries since Luther challenged the authority of the Church. 'The liberty of a Christian man' was the keynote of the former. The community of these free men in the Church is the keynote of the latter. Now looked at historically these two movements in the Christian Church are simply expressions in the life of religion of the great underlying social movements of the time. The mediaeval synthesis broke on the rediscovery of the central meaning of the individual, of freedom, of the release of the powers of the human mind and will, of the responsibility of every man to share in controlling his own destiny. The break-up of the authoritative Church, the controversies and resultant schisms, the sorry picture of a divided Christian Church were part of the movement of the whole western world. But three centuries of freedom brought men to discover that the real liberty they sought could be found only in community and slowly the movement of society swung back to collectivism in some form. The Church responded to this new direction through increasing cooperation among Christians and finally in the realisation that in its disunity it had so far repudiated its 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism.'

"The Ecumenical Movement reflects the movement of society toward collectivism and toward one world; toward the understanding that true freedom is found only in community. In that way God is teaching the Church through the world. But step by step as it learns there falls upon it from God the responsibility of revealing to the World (to history) the meaning of what has been happening to it. But that revealing task is accomplished only in so far as the Churches become the Church—to be specific at this moment of history, only in so far as the World Council can express the common faith. The significance of the World Council for the world is that it witnesses to the meaning of the world's own struggle for unity. It is the earnest, the promise, the prophecy of the achievement of world unity. In very practical application—a divided Church seems hypocritical as it asks the nations of the world to unite, but Churches seeking unity can reveal the deep meanings of human life, can lead, can inspire, can help the nations to their goal."

VI

But let us not leave our exhortation to Christian Unity in vague generality. What, more precisely, is the Christian Unity demanded of the Churches in our time? Not, in the first instance or immediately, I venture to suggest, organic union of all the churches. Those enamoured of the far-off divine event all too readily evade the near and instant divine imperative. Not organic union, but an obligation far more immediate and immediately achievable. Here are some of its specifications:

1. *A united strategy*—the planning of the entire world evangelistic enterprise of the Churches as one organic movement, determined in the light of the *total task* and the *total resources* available.

2. *A united message*—the same message, unmistakably one, though spoken in a variety of tongues, as those of different languages and cultures and traditions utter the same, unmistakably the same, message.

3. *A united program,* made possible by the pooling of all resources—men and

money—and their deployment according to a united plan for largest effectiveness.

4. *A united leadership*—the conscription of the ablest leaders out of every Communion for the service of all the Churches, the whole Church, the One Church.

5. *A united community*, fellowship, *koinonia*—made possible by a commanding rededication in the face of *One Christ* and *One World*.

TRENDS IN OLD TESTAMENT INTRODUCTIONS FROM 1930 TO THE PRESENT

By JOHN H. SCAMMON

Andover Newton Theological School

A great deal of rethinking has been going on in regard to the Old Testament. One senses it as he glances over the relatively recent book titles: *The Old Testament: A Reinterpretation;*[1] *The Rediscovery of the Old Testament;*[2] and *The Old Testament in the World Church, With Special Reference to the Younger Churches.*[3]

This article is the result of an objective survey of some of the Old Testament introductions of the last eighteen years. Here too there are evidences of rethinking, and an attempt will be made to discern the trends. The closing paragraph will contain a few practical suggestions.

I

First of all, one notes the complete absence, in this period, of a full-length, scientific introduction in English by a Jewish scholar.

Now there are some very good reasons why Jewish Biblical studies have often followed different patterns from those of Christian scholars. A succinct and valuable statement of these can be found in Rabbi Felix A. Levy's article, "Contemporary Trends in Jewish Bible Study," in the recently-published symposium, *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow.*[4]

Yet one finds that there were scientific Jewish introductions in German seventy-five years ago, such as those by Julius Fürst,[5] David Cassel,[6] and Abraham Geiger.[7] In recent years there have been several in Hebrew.[8] And in English Margolis[9] and Montefiore[10] both wrote brief treatments of the subject. Wishing to be sure that no full-length ones

[1] By S. A. Cook (N. Y.: Macmillan, 1936).

[2] By H. H. Rowley (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946).

[3] By G. E. Phillips (London: Lutterworth Press, 1942).

[4] Ed. by H. R. Willoughby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947).

[5] *Geschichte der biblischen Literatur und des jüdisch-hellenistischen Schrifttums* (1867–70). 2 vols.

[6] *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur* (1872–73). 2 vols.

[7] *Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (1876).

[8] Simon Bernfeld, M. H. Segal, and Ezekiel Kaufmann have all contributed noteworthy books in Hebrew.

[9] *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1922).

[10] *A Short Devotional Introduction to the Hebrew Bible for the Use of Jews and Jewesses* (London: Macmillan, 1936).

had been missed in the course of his survey, the author wrote to President (now Emeritus) Julian Morgenstern of Hebrew Union College. His reply was significant: "I regret that I must reply that no Introduction to the Old Testament [in English], of scientific character, has as yet been written by any Jewish scholar. This is not surprising for, actually, it is only in the course of the last thirty years or so that Jewish scholars have ventured to approach the scientific interpretation of the Old Testament in systematic manner. Eventually, no doubt, such an Introduction to the Old Testament from a Jewish standpoint will be written." All of this is true in spite of the fact that Jewish scholarship has produced a great deal of most excellent work on specific subjects. One would suggest that there ought to be a full-length, scientific Jewish introduction in English before 1950.

II

Let us now turn to Roman Catholic scholarship. All are aware of a rapidly increasing vigor among Catholic scholars the world over. This stems from the Papal Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" (1893).

Among Catholic Old Testament introductions, one of the best is that by Father John E. Steinmueller. The pertinent material is in Volumes I and II of his *Companion to Scripture Studies.*[11] Volume I covers Inspiration, Canon, Texts, Hermeneutics, Exegesis, Antiquities, and Geography. In the appendix are the Muratorian Fragment, the Decrees "Sacrosancta" and "Insuper" (both 1546), the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus" (1893), the Decree "Lamentabili" (1907), a section from "Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae" (1907), and the Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus" (1920). All but the first of these are in translation. Volume II deals with the individual Old Testament books (the Protestant canon plus Apocrypha).

One is struck right off by the extensive, valuable bibliographies scattered all through the work. Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic books and periodicals are listed in abundance. The references include the best writing that is being done on the subject.

The second thing that may surprise some readers is the full statement of views and arguments not acceptable to the Catholic Church. There is a good chart of the Graf-Wellhausen theory with dates (Vol. II, p. 32); a list of the passages of the entire Pentateuch according to the documentary sources (II, p. 33).

One's first reaction might be that here is evidence of a new Catholic recognition of Protestant and Jewish scholarship. But such a conclusion is hasty. By comparing Steinmueller's work with Father Gigot's *Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament,* first published over forty-five years ago,[12] one sees that both books show the widest familiarity with liberal and conservative writings of all shades and tints. Now Gigot wrote before the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (1905–1910); and an objective survey of the two works reveals that today, in Catholic scholarship, there is a growing tendency toward standardization because of the necessity of conforming to the decisions of the Commission. (Of course, one

[11] N. Y.: Wagner, 1941–43.

[12] Second ed. (N. Y.: Benziger Bros., 1903).

recognizes that these decrees are not felt to be immutable.)

However, that is not the whole story. Within the areas which are open to debate among Roman Catholic scholars there continue to be intensive work and divergent views. Steinmueller suggests that there are faulty readings and glosses (II, pp. 24, 57); that certain texts show great corruption (II, p. 89); that some Psalms may have been joined together, and that others have been split apart (II, p. 182).

The picture, then, among the scholars in this group, is that of intensely vigorous study, and, within the bounds set by the Church, of widespread and independent research. It is well to note Albright's statement in his contribution to the symposium above referred to (although the author of this article does not entirely concur): "Catholic biblical scholarship will soon take the lead in such fields as biblical languages, textual criticism, historical background, and Palestinian archeology." [13]

III

Turning now to conservative Protestant circles, an objective study discloses a certain trend toward the recognition of some positions of liberal scholarship. Samuel A. Cartledge's *Conservative Introduction to the Old Testament* [14] is a case in point. Dr. Cartledge, incidentally, is a New Testament scholar, having earned his Ph.D. under Edgar J. Goodspeed at Chicago.

This is a significant book. Written by a self-confessed conservative teaching at a conservative theological school (Columbia, in Decatur, Georgia), it lacks the dogmatism which all too often has been shown in liberal ranks as well as others! The author says he "has made an honest attempt to evaluate other approaches with an open mind, but he has reached conclusions in harmony with the ancient beliefs of historic Christianity" (p. 8). He warns that "conservative criticism has sought to defend entirely too much of what was based on mere tradition rather than on fact" (p. 18). One might wish that all schools of thought would profit by his stand. "God expects us to make use of all the facts that may be brought to light from any quarter" (p. 8). Cartledge takes a clear stand with the school of progressive revelation (p. 21). There is no mechanical theory of inspiration found here (pp. 59, 60). "There are certain minor contradictions between parts of the Bible, at least in the best texts that are available to us now" (p. 60). The titles of the Psalms "have not the slightest right to be considered a part of the inspired Bible" (p. 179). ". . . one can hold a very high view of inspiration and still believe that Isaiah did not write the latter part of the book that now bears his name" (pp. 129, 130).

Here is a conservative book that grows out of serious and thorough research. Among the books published by writers of this school, it points toward a new recognition of values in certain positions hitherto held only by scholars of a more liberal group.

IV

The last group of introductions to be examined comes from the Protestant liberal and liberal-radical schools. One would gladly survey many works here,

[13] P. 168.

[14] 2d ed. (Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1944).

such as those by Oesterley and Robinson, Bewer (rev. ed.), Eissfeldt, McFadyen (2d ed.), Sellin (7th ed.), Cook, Pfeiffer, and H. W. Robinson. It will be necessary to confine the study to two of these, those of Oesterley and Robinson,[15] and Pfeiffer.[16]

The two books form an interesting contrast. Oesterley and Robinson's work is the third on which they have collaborated. W. O. E. Oesterly was Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis at King's College, University of London, from 1926 to 1936, when, at the age of seventy, he retired. Theodore H. Robinson occupied the chair of Semitic Languages at University College, Cardiff, Wales, from 1927 to 1944, having served as Lecturer there for the preceding twelve years.

Their introduction has had wide use in theological seminaries. They attempted to write a book which would be halfway between the exhaustive work of Driver and the comparatively brief works of Gray and of McFayden. They also claim to give more historical background than the shorter works; the text of the Septuagint is emphasized as useful for the reconstruction of the Hebrew; and one sees a new approach to the study of the prophetical books, one which gives more weight to the metrical structure of the writings.

Pfeiffer's book is truly encyclopedic. It represents the first large-scale, detailed, non-popular work of this type since Driver (of which the last real revision was in 1910). There are 838 rather large pages of text, followed by three of abbreviations, a two-page chart of chapter and verse differences between the Hebrew and the English Bibles, 35 pages of selected subject bibliography (including not only the canonical Old Testament books but also the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical ones), and finally, three indices—author, Biblical reference, and subject.

This is more than an introduction. It is a reference work, with remarkably complete historical surveys of work already done (for example, on Isaiah 40–66, and on Daniel). It is at times almost a brief commentary (note the fine summary of Isaiah 1–39 [pp. 416 ff.]). At other times it is almost an Old Testament theology (there is a valuable survey of the thought of God in Proverbs [pp. 653, 655] and in Amos [pp. 580 ff.]). One finds also something of literary history; Pfeiffer brings out the literary flavor of the Pentateuchal documents better than any other introduction with which the present writer is acquainted (for example, pp. 157, 177).

Looking at Oesterley and Robinson and at Pfeiffer at the same time, one can discern certain trends which are true of many of the recent liberal and liberal-radical writings.

First, at least a slight trend toward earlier dating is noticeable. This is not evident in Pfeiffer unless it is shown in an early date (tenth century) for his "S" document; and one suspects that where most of the book adopts, in general, late dates, that this example should not be given. On the other hand, Oesterley and Robinson's early dates for certain Psalms surely reveal a trend that has been apparent since the Ras Shamra discoveries and the work of Mowinckel. One feels safe in saying that the pres-

[15] Oesterley, W. O. E., and Robinson, T. H., *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament* (N. Y.: Macmillan, 1934).

[16] *Introduction to the Old Testament* (N. Y.: Harper, 1941).

ent generation represents, in general, a reaction from the tendency of a previous generation to place all the Old Testament writings as late as possible. (We must never forget, if a look at the New Testament field may be allowed for a moment, that a fragment of a copy of the Fourth Gospel was found which probably circulated in Egypt at least a decade or two earlier than the date which F. C. Baur and Bruno Bauer gave the original writing!)

One finds a second trend along the lines of a more conservative handling of the text. Here Oesterley and Robinson and Pfeiffer are again in contrast. Pfeiffer's work, in this regard, represents a slowly receding movement in Old Testament introductions: a tendency to edit the text with the greatest of freedom, with rather too much finality, and sometimes without divulging to the reader his reasons for so doing (e.g., p. 416). While he may be perfectly right in assigning so many glosses, he is working against a trend which allows more latitude of style to an individual author and, to use Pfeiffer's own words, does not try to "impose . . . the strait jacket of our logical consistency" upon a member of another race and another millennium (see pp. 534, 535). This may be said along with an expression of great admiration for most of the features of this monumental introduction.

Oesterley and Robinson, on the other hand, while they are certainly open-minded on the matter of textual corruption, show in their handling of the Hebrew texts a caution and conservatism that is consistent with a present-day trend. R. A. Bowman, in the symposium already referred to, speaking of the Psalms mentions the fact that ". . . we regard the former vogue of excessive deletions and emendations on the basis of meter as being out of date . . ." (p. 11). And he sums up the present trend as "an acceptance of the sound work of the past and an indorsement of its critical methodology, but a less daring and more conservative application of it in dealing with the text" (p. 29).

And finally, one sees here an increasing transition from literary histories of the Old Testament to introductions to religious writings. This, of course, is part and parcel of the new interest in Biblical theology. I refer for documentation to an exceedingly interesting and forceful article in the October, 1947, *Journal of Bible and Religion*, entitled "Conduct Objectives in Teaching the Old Testament," by Lowell B. Hazzard.

At this point both Pfeiffer and Oesterley and Robinson show evidences of the current trend. The former has a list of "Fifty representative Psalms," chosen not only for literary quality but for originality of thought and *for religious value* (italics mine) (pp. 640 ff.). Both books, while they bring out the *literary* elements of the Old Testament, focus their interest on the *religious* values. Well does Rowley write in his *Rediscovery of the Old Testament* of getting "out from under the weight of scholarship" (Preface, p. [7]). It seems to me, if I may use a comparison, that we have passed the stage where an appreciation of a sunset involves only the listing and cataloging of the beautiful colors which are represented.

V

The only thing left to do is to make two brief, practical suggestions growing out of the study.

First, a very wholesome forward step would be a cooperative Old Testament Introduction of the nature of a symposium, to which Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish scholars would contribute. This might well be a work in which each section of the Old Testament would be handled first by one and then by the others in turn—that is about all we can expect at the present moment—but it would give seminarians a large-range view which they certainly do not receive at present, and would also draw our three groups closer together. One certainly does not expect agreement, but one would very much like to see a volume which would represent the best scholarship in all three of the present divisions.

Second, there might well be an abandonment of the present prosy type of introduction and an employment of the newer educational techniques. This might well involve at least some of the following: (1) abundant pictures and illustrative material (see Chiera's *They Wrote on Clay* [17] and Kenyon's books); (2) the preparation of a set of slides to accompany a book, as was done in the case of a work in another theological field (Bainton's *Church of Our Fathers* [18]); (3) a much more vivid type of writing (foreshadowed by the excellent retelling of the Biblical events in Bewer and Pfeiffer, and in the popular treatment by Longacre [19]); (4) time lines, histomaps, and three-dimensional cartography that would make the present ones look much out-of-date; (5) such things as recordings of good readings of Hebrew poetry (would that we knew more about it!); and (6) an introduction that would be suitable for a seminar in which a small group of students would interleave their own Bibles, writing, in essence, their own introductions.

These suggestions are submitted with the hope that future Old Testament introductions will more and more fulfil what I consider their primary function, namely, to make men want to read and study *the Old Testament*, to enable them to do so more intelligently, and thus to give them a spiritual appreciation of material which is not primarily literary but religious.

[17] Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

[18] N. Y.: Scribner, 1941.

[19] *The Old Testament, Its Form and Purpose* (Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1945).

THE TEACHER

By GEORGE VAN SANTVOORD

Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.*

"And seeing the multitudes, we went up into a mountain; and when he had sat down his disciples came unto him. And he opened his mouth and taught them. . . ."

—St. Matthew 5:1, 2.

These two verses at the opening of the Sermon on the Mount are of importance to you young men preparing for the Christian ministry because you are to be *teachers*. This aspect of your work will be akin to that of my own profession, and I am glad to have the opportunity of talking briefly to you about it.

Teaching is interesting work. Some experience in the classroom would be valuable to you as preliminary training before you enter the ministry and I should strongly advise you to seize upon it if the opportunity of such experience comes to you. Phillips Brooks, you may remember, spent a year teaching at the Boston Latin School after graduating from Harvard. He had difficulty in maintaining discipline—difficulty hard to understand in view of his later success in the pulpit—and felt that he should not choose teaching as a career.

We who are professional teachers must keep order in our classrooms—otherwise no one will learn. We must be ready for questions, discussion, or disagreement on the part of our pupils; and finally we must make sure that they master the material taught, at least adequately enough to pass daily tests and final examinations, and be ready for more advanced work.

You as clergymen will not have these difficulties—or advantages. Congregations in these days are not unruly in church, nor will they dispute with you from the pews. But if you cannot teach your people effectively, you will not properly accomplish your work as a Christian minister. Your task is not mere exhortation; still less scolding people for staying away from church or for more grievous faults. If you have any vital contacts with people today, you know that they need instruction, and will try hard to gain skill as a teacher.

With you, teaching will be only one phase of your work, yet a very important phase. I believe we can gain some principles of very real value to you from study of the three chapters in St. Matthew's Gospel in which is set down this longest single discourse of Our Lord.

First of all let us note briefly the *place*—on a mountain, where quiet and absence of interruption are assured. Note too that the teacher *sat down*. In America, perhaps because of our nervous energy, the common practice is for the teacher to stand or even to move about, as Horace Mann thought so admirable in his observation of schoolmasters in Prussia. This tradition in the Western world goes back at least as far as the Peripatetic philosophers in Greece. In the East it is quite different, and at the Moslem University of Cairo today one finds the teacher seated on the ground with his disciples sitting all about him.

* A Chapel address at Union Theological Seminary, November 12, 1947.

In the Orthodox Church, I understand, the preacher sometimes speaks while seated in a chair—an interesting touch of oriental tradition which we in the West might do well to observe and study.

But neither place nor posture is the principal concern of the good teacher. What is most important is the *content* of the teaching and the method of the teacher. Let us look at the words of our Lord as recorded in the Sermon on the Mount. Most interesting and compelling is the evidence of his mastery of the art of teaching. Notice first his use of the maxim—profound thought concentrated in a brief sentence. Note the emphasis by repetition of the word *Blessed,* and the conclusion in the second clause, startlingly unexpected, or even paradoxical:

> Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.
> Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.
> Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

Variety of method is essential to successful teaching. The mind soon tires if one device is overworked. So he swiftly varies his method and the metaphor, an essentially poetical device, succeeds the maxim: "Ye are the salt of the earth. . . . Ye are the light of the world. . . . Let your light so shine before men."

Notice that the imagery, though poetical is familiar and easy for the hearers to graps. It is drawn from the experience of everyday life. It requires no long-extended or tiring flight, yet it lifts one from the dull earth into the higher air of imagination—often with a touch of humor, or a trace of the wisdom of ancient folklore: "Wolves in sheep's clothing . . . the beam in thine own eye . . . the mote in thy brother's eye. . . . Do men gather figs of thistles or grapes of thorns?"

From metaphor the passage to simile is natural and obvious: "wise as serpents . . . harmless as doves; a wise man who built his house upon a rock . . . a foolish man who built his house upon the sand. . . ."

The simple earthy quality of the imagery is essential if his hearers are to grasp it, and we cannot overemphasize its value in teaching: "If his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?"

From the simile, still further extended, Jesus in his later teaching evolved the parable, embodying his teaching in a narrative, where the vivid short story won the minds and hearts of auditors not only in his own day, but for all time. In most of the parables there is the touch of realism: "A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho. . . ." A *certain* man had two sons. . . ." Some of the most effective sermons today are cast in parable form—for example Dr. Cyril Alington's *Shrewsbury Fables.*

Note also another device, most effective always in making a point crystal clear. Beginning with Chapter 5 verse 17, there are no less than ten instances of antithesis: "It was said by them of old time . . . but *I say unto you.* The passive voice in the first clause and the active in the second is an interesting contrast, the first so much less vigorous and vital than the second. The Old Law was known and reverenced by his hearers. They took it as their standard of conduct and morals. Now they are given a new code, and the repeated antitheses make the contrast as distinct as black

and white. Man was formerly judged by overt act, of which other men were adequate witnesses. Now he stands in the unerring view of that Father unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid. The thoughts of man's mind and the desires of his heart are the realm of the new Kingdom of heaven.

Thus in terms no one could forget he sets forth with utmost clarity and brevity his teaching about the Law, wrath, lust, oaths, revenge, hate, almsgiving, prayer, fasting and riches. Almost every sentence in these three chapters has entered into the current speech of every land where Christianity has spread. The words of the Lord's Prayer, repeated daily by millions of men, exemplify the qualities of the whole discourse. Every phrase is typical of the mind and spirit which produce it, reflecting qualities of penetration, wisdom and clarity. The truth is its own witness when set forth in these terms, and you who are to teach it must strive to attain to such skill that in your turn you may become 'fishers of men,' acquiring in your own nature and practicing in your own lives the ideals which will enable you to give forth to others the faith that animates you.

Church Congress Syllabus 51

ORDER AND FREEDOM

A Philosophical Approach

By John S. Marshall

University of the South

Order is Heav'n's first Law.
Pope

In this day of political chaos it is hard for us to realize that we are living in an ordered world of complicated structure and design, of which the advance of natural science is making us more and more the masters. Not only is the physical universe a well arranged system, but the domain of living things is as well ordered as that of the physical world. By the use of mathematical analysis, D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, in *Growth and Form*, reveals the structure of animate nature as a realm of order, and thus as a biologist, can use the words of the ancient philosophers and say as did Plato, θεὸς ἀεὶ γεωμετρεῖ "God geometrizes eternally."

It is not wise in our day to build a philosophy of nature without the recognition of the all-pervading character of natural order; and if we pass on from a philosophy of the natural order to that of the God of nature, the most relevant conception seems to be that of God as the source of order and ordered meaning. God is the cause of the order of the universe because He is not only a geometrician but is also the origin of all law. An ancient English prayer says, "Almighty God, whose providence in his ordinance faileth not"; and it is in the failing not that the continuity and order of natural and moral law reveal themselves.

If we trace the grades of reality from the domain of the lowest to the realm of the highest, it is always the same—it is always a matter of law and order. The smallest thing visible to the most powerful microscope has its rank and place, and is understandable by order; and the elements of reality inferentially known from their effects are understood mathematically and thus revealed to be carefully arranged in their operations. But this is not only true of the infinitely small, it is quite as true of the infinitely large. There too is law and order, and thus from high to low it is always the same, for all is in its place. So that when we think of a philosophy of the universe, reaching from the uttermost electron to the largest star, from the smallest protozoon to the Seraph nigh to the throne of God, it is to realize that order and not chaos, meaning and not meaninglessness, passes in review before us.

Yet, history does not seem to fit into such a philosophy of the universe. It does not appear ordered, but distinctly orderless, and a chaos past understanding. We see it as something irrational embedded in the firm structure of the rational. It seems futile to attempt to find the meaning of the successions of confused events as they pass before us. Yet, our minds do call out for meaning, and demand that the significance of history be revealed to us.

The order of the universe is simple

to trace, compared with that in human affairs, because human affairs are complicated by the fact of freedom. In the ordered whole of things man has a unique position, he is creatively free, and therefore the laws of his being are constantly modified in action by the fact of human choice.

There is an order in things human because of the constant factor in human nature itself: the basic aspects of our Anglo-American Common Law rest on this constancy of human nature. The sameness of the nature of man is a factor which gives order and constancy in human affairs.

But there is a variable factor also in human life, this is the result of man's creativity. Human beings can distort and misuse both themselves and physical nature. This abuse of freedom creates a modification of human life and its nature that complicates the realm of history. It complicates but does not completely remove purpose and order from history because of a factor not included in either man or nature. If we consider the whole universe as a graded series, we find that God is primary and that man and nature are secondary. God is above both man and nature; but God is not only above man, He is a primary cause and man is a secondary cause. That means that man and nature are tools in the hands of God. Thus it is that God can use even the wrath of man for His own praise. What the human does is not ultimate, but is causation on a lower level of reality. What we do does make a difference, but it does not make the ultimate difference, because God uses what we do in His own way.

It is interesting to note that there has been a school of historians that has believed in history in terms of God as primary cause and man as secondary cause. They have written history in terms of the ordered Providence of God interacting with the life of man. It is a school that has stressed human freedom and responsibility, and yet has also maintained a resolute belief in the Providence of God in the affairs of men. Their firm belief and resolute faith have been in a God, "whose providence in his ordinance faileth not." Their names are ones to conjure with, great ones in the scenes of history itself. They are those of Raleigh, Clarendon, Bishop Stubbs, and Winston Churchill. These are men who not only wrote history but made it, and not only understood it but guided it.

1. *Man as Cause and God as Cause.*— Although man is a secondary and not a primary cause, he really is a causal factor in history. What each of us does has an effect on the historic process. For the want of a horseshoe nail the battle was lost, and for the want of a capable blacksmith there was thus a decision made in the destiny of nations. The theory that whatever I do makes no real difference in the final result of things is a deadly and fatalistic conception, one that stultifies effort and destroys the sense of responsibility at each moment of crisis. The notion that it would have made no difference to the destiny of his country whether there had been a Washington or not, or whether he had accepted responsibility or not, is a very serious distortion of every bit of evidence we have. Even the countries that teach this theory, such as Soviet Russia with its doctrine of mass man, deny it in practice by being the very nations of strong rulers, the coun-

tries of powerful and creative leaders. And it is noticeable that in moments of crisis our own notions of the supreme wisdom of the electorate give way, and we too use great men to carry us through to victory. It is in times of general peace and prosperity, or at least in periods when the emergency is not recognized as such, that our democracies do without the guiding hand of competent leadership.

Beyond man there is a higher force acting in the affairs of men which is directive and strategic in human history. According to some, this power is a directive Providence who foresees, directs, and corrects; according to others, it is a Divine Rhythm in history, which, if we work with it, aids us and directs us; if we work against it, it destroys us, and grinds us between its ever turning millstones. But according to each of these theories human beings are the secondary causes in history and God is the primary cause. In the end, we propose and He disposes. In the long run, and that is the only perspective for history, history proves to be the narrative of God's victory, though a victory in which there is great human loss. Even in the defeats of the forces of righteousness there is evidence that God is Lord and King.

2. *Man's Place in the Drama of History.*—We must not fail to emphasize the place of man in the drama of history. The whole character of human experience reveals his importance. And that is not only the result of the new stress on man in the Renaissance and the Reformation, it is also the burden of much of St. Thomas' thought. It was the Angelic Doctor who opposed Augustinianism and asserted the freedom of man's will and the actuality of man's causal power in politics and morals. This was a lesson he learned from Aristotle, and he did well to learn it. The later Middle Ages assert it as does the Renaissance; and the Bible as much as either of them.

The historical method of Clarendon, Stubbs, and Churchill is thus rich in the heritage of the ages. It is biblical and philosophical, mediaeval, Elizabethan, and modern. It is so fresh and vigorous that it seems to be a new method of historical thought, yet it is founded on the older notions of human creativity and of Divine Providence. The focal point of this method is biblical, and yet it is also classical, mediaeval, and contemporary in character. There is a mosaic quality about it, and this makes possible the union of many elements in the spirit of the Two Testaments. The heritage of the Bible makes it possible to bring together Divine Providence and human initiative. On one side, the human side, history is the interaction of individuals. Humans are true subordinate factors in history, and as subordinate factors are real and influential.

Such critics as Firth fail to understand this theory because they think that it sees no place in history for group movements. As a matter of fact, we must recognize that group movements do exist in history, but we must view them as the interaction of persons, rather than as mere human masses as such, because we must see the interaction of persons within a group if we are actually to see the group created as a group. A movement is really the activity of a great many individuals functioning through a common purpose, but each person interacting with many others.

This approach to history is very much like that of modern physics. We may see a movement at a distance as a great wave, but a very close analysis reveals an organization containing a vast number of component parts, each with its own character. A complete understanding of history reveals a nexus of human personalities as they act upon each other. These are secondary causes, and together with Providence give history its dramatic character as the interplay of human beings in the actual drama of things.

Nations are a nexus of personalities, but these personalities are not all on the same level. Thus, history itself has a higher unity through leaders, and becomes cohesive and coherent through their directive personalities. If the leaders are merely average persons, then the nations become mediocre; if the nations have great leadership, then they become great. There must be actual genius in leadership to create great nations. A nation as a mere group does not create except as stimulated by leadership. If the leader is great and he is followed, then there is national greatness. The light of a great man's soul is a lesser light, even though a gleam. So there is a true nobility of the great soul. There is a Christian conception of the great-souled man as well as an Aristotelian conception. The Christian has humility before the glory of Almighty God, but he also honors greatness in his fellow men, and seeks for himself that true self-respect which gives him a sense of honor and nobility. This is true Humanism.

God is the Supreme Individual, but man is also an individual, and like God he has free will, and in some sense is made in the image of God. Thus man has the power to be good, and should have that sense of decency and self-respect that makes him scorn the base and ignoble, and live his life in the spirit of Christian greatness. But all leaders are not men of Christian greatness, good men of high courage and fine insight who lead the nations on to glory and honor. There are also men of evil minds and cunning methods who lead the nations on to cruelty and bloodshed, hatred and dishonor. They too have power, they too are subordinate causes. But their position is different from that of those we have just considered, for they lead on their followers to destruction and despair, even though they lead with power and with might. The pages of history are filled with the names of such wicked men, the stage of history echoes and reechoes with their power, their might, their activities. But the stars in their courses fight against Sisera and all his kind, and their latter end is destruction, and destruction of many innocent besides.

Thus, although it is not at first obvious, all higher societies are shaped by their leaders, whether good or bad, noble or ignoble, elected or self-appointed. Even in mass movements there are leaders who express a commonly assumed conviction in a very simple form, just as in more complex organizations the conviction is expressed in a more subtle and complex form. The leadership may not be such as is easily discerned, and for that reason receives a delicate and intricate direction from leaders who are not recognized as such. Every new idea in a social group, every new motivation given to a corporation, a society, or a nation, is the result of the thoughts of

men and women who create the ideas that produce the direction and action of the group.

3. *Man and his Freedom.*—How is it possible to conceive of the state as an organism when the individual is the key to the character of the nation? The answer, I believe, is both biblical and natural. The state is an organism because it is a group of individuals bound together by the natural relationship of a common purpose. This purpose expresses itself not only in the Common Law as a way of interaction of the persons in the social whole, but in the ideals of the leaders of society and their apprehension of social meaning. Social relationships, therefore, reduce themselves to similar ways of interaction between individuals. The Aristotelian form is here reduced to a mode of interaction, and hence needs an explanation beyond itself. The explanation is to be found in the character of social causation. A man can act together with another man; causation is thus real and is not merely apparent. Society is thus real because it is the resultant of many individuals acting and reacting upon each other. Normally, it has its highest unity in a personal leader, and in the habitual modes of reciprocal action called laws.

The social organism is a special type of organism, and is the result of interaction and leadership. It is not, therefore, a mode of existence above that of persons and personal causation. In fact, it is the development of the notion of personality, for the person is the individual in reaction with his fellows. This type of social theory is not an individualism: it is the theory of the person as an individual in interaction with his fellows. It is emphatic in its notion of cause and effect, and hesitant in its affirmation of clear and explicit social purpose. It is the heir of Alexander of Aphrodisias rather than the Platonic Aristotelians. Society has purpose through leadership, but it also has many compromises and half-purposes.

Society is not the result of a fixed form, it is rather the result of the dynamic interaction of millions of human personalities, and has its unity in their similarities of purpose and the leadership that both expresses and creates that purpose. There is no social creation that does not spring from the creative power of individuals. If there are great leaders and they are followed, then there are great purposes in society. If the leaders are petty and express only lesser insights, then society lacks unity and tends to disintegrate into a mass held together by prejudices and rumors. Strictly speaking, there is no social creation, but there is, first, the creation of leaders who produce more or less successful movements within society, and there is, second, the creative activity of their followers who also react in their turn. History, then, is the study of leaders and their followers, and of the interaction of lesser and greater persons. The leader, by interaction with his followers, may learn to lead, and he learns not only from the insight of his followers but from his experience as a leader. There is then no social organism that has a life apart from personal causation, and so its highest creative power lies in the personal interaction of man upon man, of leader upon follower, of follower upon leader.

The foundation of the notion of

freedom is free causality. Causality is not only the product of the laws of order, it is the source of the creative power of interaction. Both causality and freedom are fundamental. They are both real and are the source of the novelty and beauty as well as the tragedy and disaster of the world. Men have the power of blessing and destruction, and have moulded each other and nature into patterns according to their will. Thus, they have produced consequences they have never desired or expected. Ours is a world of law and freedom, a world of Nature, Man, and God.

The world is tragic, but it is the vale of the making of souls, and we must expect sorrow and defeats. But we must also believe that a perfection not yet dreamed of is possible if freedom is used aright. Good does not spring from evil; disease is not a higher health, sin a higher good, tragedy a more exquisite beauty. Evil, ugliness, and disease are not the stuff of a good world, they are a part of that tragedy that results from freedom. There is a curse on man, his creativity is the cause of his damnation. But it is the source also of his creative goodness, for it may lead him to cooperate with God for his salvation from the curse that blights his life.

4. *God, Man, and Freedom.*—We have outlined a humanism that stresses freedom and human creativity, that accentuates human responsibility and the dignity of human endeavor. Such a theory has never made man a mere puppet in the Punch and Judy show of life, or a merely predestined creation that may be damned for the greater glory of God. Man has a dignity and a value, and is capable either of great glory or great dishonor. Responsibility is a priceless gift or a cause of woe. We must work out our salvation as individuals and as citizens, with the knowledge that in our hands is the possibility of the success or the failure of our lives and the life of the state. God of course is in the universe, but He never saves a civilization that condemns itself either by wilful action or by ignorance. Our responsibility is great: that is the terrible price of our freedom.

However, this, our traditional Christian philosophy of life, is not deism; it is not the conception that God has no part in the affairs of men and our salvation. There is a humanistic phase in this system, but that is not the whole position. The versatility, the richness of the conception, is its glory. It does believe in man, in his capacity for good and for evil, but it also believes in God and His place in the affairs of men. It is Divine Providence that completes the picture and saves it from a one-sided emphasis.

God is the Supreme Individual, who acts causally upon human individuals. He acts upon you and me, even in our inward parts. He may inspire me, reprove me, punish me by acting directly upon me, for He is capable of causal action upon me. His action is more inward than that of human individuals upon me, for He is pure spirit, whereas other beings act upon me in a less spiritual manner. But this action upon me does not mean that He is part of me or I a part of Him. Each of us is an individual, although God is a different sort of individual than I am.

In history God is not the whole, He is not the cause of all actions, but He is the King Eternal, the Lord and Re-

deemer of the universe. He acts, and through His acts gives a rhythm to history by shaping it, moulding it, redeeming it. God acts not only in terms of appeal, as does the human leader, but also as an efficient cause, for He is both guide and corrector. However, as efficient cause there is less of coercion than correction, and less of correction than redemption. The forces of God's love correct and redeem. The wounds of the earth are healed, and the scars effaced. Through His action there is a rhythm in history, a divine causation that heals and adjusts even though the tragedy is there as well. All is not lost, for there is a healing in His wings, and salvation in His care for us.

Such a philosophy makes God the supreme factor in the movement of history. His is the force that directs all things towards corrective and remedial justice. The Incarnation and Atonement thus fit into the fabric of history. They are organic to it, and are a supreme revelation of the Divine Providence active in the history of the world. Along with a tremendous belief in our responsibility for the result of things, we must also realize that God works together with us for righteousness. Ours is the responsibility, but without Him we are without our King, our Ruler, whom we must have if all is not to be lost. He is our Lord, our Saviour, our King. With Him the force of the Lord of Hosts is with us, without Him there is only failure even in success. As Kingsley points out, God is a great General, a great Strategist, who out of victory may cause defeat, and out of defeat may bring ultimate victory. This does not mean that the evil becomes good, or the good evil. It means that order does triumph, and that at an awful cost goodness prevails.

Of course history is sad, but it is not dismal, for in it we see God redeeming the world. Evil does triumph, sin does destroy; and yet the triumph is pyrrhic, the defeat is never complete. The strategy of God is supreme, for His rule is the governance of the Most High. He fights for us if we fight for the right, but we must follow His ways and cooperate with Him, if He is to help us. We must fight His battles with Him as our General if we are to win. Thus, out of chaos order emerges, and meaning arises because things that are human, under God's guidance, become secondary to things which are eternal.

Books for Further Reading

1. Berdyaev, N., *The Meaning of History*, Scribners, 1936.
2. Burckhardt, Jacob, *Force and Freedom*, Pantheon, 1943.
3. Churchill, Winston, *Thoughts and Adventures*, Macmillan, 1942.
4. Stubbs, Bp. William, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediaeval and Modern History*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1887.
5. Temple, Archbp. William, *Christus Veritas*, Macmillan, 1926.
6. Toynbee, Arnold J., *Civilization on Trial*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1948.
7. Toynbee, Arnold J., *A Study of History*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1947.

Suggestions for Discussion

1. What does God do in history? Is there a 'manifest destiny' in the Divine plan for our nation and for the world?

2. Why do those who believe in a predestined course in history tend to place small stress on the creative powers of both leaders and followers?

3. What is the place of the Incarnation and the Atonement in world history? Does the acceptance of these doctrines commit us to a conception of history as following a plan of development?

THE TASK OF AN ILLUSION

By MARY E. CLARKSON

Philadelphia

Though St. Paul's summary in (I Corinthians 15:4–8) of the Resurrection appearances is the earliest account, it is clearly based on the faith of the apostles from whom he received it. For without that faith, there would have been neither church to persecute nor conversion of the persecutor. While St. Paul, by including the appearance to himself at the end of the recital, seems to place it in the same rank with the others, yet his experience as told in the three accounts of Acts resembles the vision of St. Stephen more nearly than the appearances related in the Gospels, thus opening the question as to how he regarded them all.

As St. Luke probably heard the accounts related by St. Paul in Jerusalem and before Agrippa, he was evidently right in recounting them as visions of Christ in heaven; but the appearances in the gospels were of Christ as known on earth—like, but not wholly like—and there is no word to indicate that He was unseen by others—passers on the road to Emmaus, for example or in the house. But it is twice stated that the vision of St. Paul was not seen by the others present. The same is to be inferred from the account of Stephen's vision. Now did St. Paul assume that the appearances he recounted were visions like his own, or had he heard from the other apostles the story of their experience, without feeling that the distinction was important for his summary? Often as the question may be asked, we cannot get beyond surmise.

For us, however, the distinction is significant; for mere resumption of earthly form seems not to have been a part of eschatological expectation. Yet the fact to be remarked is that just the reappearance of their Lord brought to the disciples the same assurance, not only of His continuing life, but of His divine authority that the visions of Him in glory had brought to St. Stephen and St. Paul. In house or garden, on mountain side or in heaven, to man or woman, alone or in company, to disciple, recent convert or persecutor, the experience meant an overwhelming assurance of the vindication and supremacy of their Master. That is the note common to all accounts, and the note dwelt on by St. Peter in the appeal to his countrymen at Pentecost. Now, as it happens, the only two mentioned by name in St. Paul's list, St. Peter and James the brother of the Lord,[1] are the very two that figure most prominently (with the exception of St. Paul) in Acts and the Epistles, so that the opportunity is thus afforded of observing the subsequent course of the two men to whom, in one of the earliest acknowledged Christian writings, the experience of seeing the Risen Christ is attributed.

Because the apostles were Jews, religion and patriotism had reinforced each other in their allegiance to their Church-State and culminated in loyalty

[1] The appearance to St. Peter, though mentioned, is not related in the Synoptic Gospels. Nor that to James; but we are told of an attempt to interfere with our Lord's ministry which makes the honor granted him the more noteworthy.

to Christ. In His condemnation, therefore, not only loyalty but patriotism and faith had been outraged. More even than a loss, the disaster was a moral shock. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" had been a fundamental demand that echoed through the history of Israel. It trembled through the Psalms and the Prophets. Out of it had developed belief in immortality. In the Crucifixion it had met signal defeat. Yet seven weeks later, at Pentecost, the sting of injustice has given place to the sense of righted wrong, the bitterness of defeat to a security hardly realized during their Master's lifetime. St. Peter spoke that day as Moses might have spoken after the deliverance from Egypt. The appeal to his hearers was not that of the prophet from deed to unfolding event, from present wrong to future judgment, but to the decision already effected, the judgment pronounced.

Now there are few feelings harder to overcome without the substance of fact than resentment for injustice. In St. Peter's sermon, however, resentment has been replaced by confidence in vindication so complete that there is room even for leniency to the guilty, and the promise to the repentant of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Though the sermon, as it stands is, no doubt, the work of St. Luke—or, if preferred, the author of Acts—who wrote four or five decades after the event, the tone, the mood must have belonged to the original tradition; for it is the prevailing mood of the New Testament until the time of Domitian, and even, then, though jarred by discordant notes, it was still the dominant tone. Thucydides and Tacitus composed speeches for the personages of their histories; but they had to be suited to known character and occasion. Rejoicing could not be exchanged for laments, nor moods and outcomes falsified.

The assurance devoid of triumph and severity tempered by forebearance of St. Peter's sermon marked, also, his speeches later on to the people and the authorities, whom he resisted with all calmness. His reply, in fact, when arraigned before the Sanhedrin, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye," recalls in its firm balance our Lord's "Render unto Caesar."

The like quality of zeal tempered by sobriety was shown by St. Peter in the administration of the little Christian society in Jerusalem. Impartiality in the distribution of help to the needy was secured without infringing on the peculiar vocation of the apostles. During persection they remained at the post of danger in Jerusalem till new converts called for their presence in Samaria. All measures seem to have been taken, however, in concurrence with the other apostles, till the question arose of admitting Gentile converts. Then St. Peter acted alone with boldness, and recommended his decision persuasively. However the story of Cornelius and the two visions is to be interpreted, history has approved the course pursued.[2]

If reminded that all this information about St. Peter comes from one who evi-

[2] Against the charge that the vision of the sheet was devised to support the decision, may be alleged, *1st*, its grotesqueness, *2nd*, the unmannerly response to the command "Not so Lord," in which we hear the voice of the plain fisherman, 3rd, the unlikelihood that a religious Jew would take so momentous a step without seeking for divine guidance, much less make up a story about it!

dently disliked conflicts and quarrels and might have toned down any shrill notes, it can be answered that such dislike did not hinder him from recording the fierce rebukes to Simon Magus and Elymas, as well as St. Paul's sharp reply to the high priest. Moreover the poise shown by St. Peter could never have resulted from mere "toning down." Such union of symmetry with force must have belonged to the original pattern, or been created outright; and though St. Luke had a keen eye for people and could tell a great deal with a few strokes, he was not out to create characters.

In James, the only one beside St. Peter named in St. Paul's summary, the scales tipped still farther on the side of restraint. Not so active apparently as St. Peter in the preaching of the faith, he seems rather to have exercised the supervisory function needed in a rapidly growing body with a rudimentary organization. Scrupulous about the observance of the law, he was no less scrupulous about the method of securing what he regarded as essentials. What weight might have been given to the famous letter in Acts 15, if, after drawing support from Amos for the concessions, the regulations could have been reinforced by "a word of the Lord," instead of being based merely on "my judgment"! If ever a "Christian formation" was needed, it was then; but it was not forthcoming.

How complete was the understanding about the regulations is still open to dispute. Yet two pieces of evidence indicate that the relations of the two leaders, if not cordial, were marked by conscientious generosity. The first is St. Paul's inclusion in his recital of the appearance to James, of which we should otherwise remain ignorant. Its mention, in an epistle written probably several years after the account in Galations of the disagreement, is not without significance. The second, the effort of James to save St. Paul from misapprehension by the extreme legalizing party, though perhaps more open to question, evinces, at least, anxiety to maintain accord in the Church. Like desire seems to have prompted St. Peter's devious course at Antioch, so criticised by St. Paul, because marked by the halting uncertain footsteps of those who follow the via media.

Now the frame of mind of all three men, but more particularly of James and St. Peter as shown in their pilotage —remarkable for inexperienced men— is still more remarkable if regarded as the outcome of an illusion, phantasm, hallucination, what you will. Courage, zeal, fortitude may be the fruit of an illusion, but hardly coordinated constructiveness, for illusions are apt to go with excitability or excess, and what Acts discloses is order guided by judgment.

Granted that an illusion might restore the visible image to longing eyes and even produce conviction of survival, could it generate from the fact of right defeated the sense of right triumphant, transform the memory of their rejected Master into the bringer of man's salvation? Could it effect that change not for one person, but for many, not for a short time only but over the years? Is there any known example of an illusion achieving a comparable task?

Here and there rumors have sprung up, usually marked by grotesque features and ending obscurely, of the reappearance of some notable person after

death. The stories of great religious leaders, however, offer no parallel. Though the book describing Moses' own death was ascribed to him, there is no mention of a return to earth, except at the Transfiguration. Nor did such a belief follow Mahomet's death. Socrates, according to Plato, spent his last hours conversing about the immortality of the soul; but his disciples, who clung to his arguments, did not expect to hear him expound them further after the hemlock had taken effect. Buddah, unmolested and honored, died, at a ripe age, among his faithful monks. No myth of his resurrection took rise, if at all, till a later century, after the doctrine he taught had spread and gathered momentum per se.[3] But Christianity was the child, not the parent of the belief in Christ Risen.

Still another requirement must be met by the overworked illusion. Sometime after Pentecost began the collection and treasuring, in the story of the Passion, of the particulars of our Lord's suffering, humiliation and death. The story was taught to converts and read at meetings for worship. What a strain on faith in an illusion must that have involved! If the Resurrection reflected glory on the Crucifixion, because it proclaimed that the man who had thus suffered was the incarnate Son of God who, therefore, when He told of God's care for men knew whereof He spoke, then the emphasis on the Crucifixion is reasonable. But if it is the story of supreme goodness rejected and penalized, like Prometheus Bound, then, though a magnificent challenge to humanity, it carries no promise of help, and it would seem as if the sad fact would wear through a mere illusion.

The question, then, is this: Could a faith based on anything less than objective reality have effected what belief in the Resurrection effected? Could it have changed resentment into the sense of justice vindicated, joined with the desire of pardon for the guilty, and that, not in a world permeated by Christian teaching, but in the world of the first century? Could it have developed the Peter of the gospels into the level-headed, far-sighted leader of the Book of Acts, and have enabled him, along with his fellow disciples, to launch and steer the feeble young church through storms and among shoals, while preserving a measure of unity among widely scattered groups? Could it have prompted the careful preservation in memory of the execution and death of Jesus? Finally, could it have effected, not just one of these results, but all of them together?

[3] About Zoroaster, history has little definite to tell us.

A FRESH APPROACH TO CHRISTOLOGY

By SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

Episcopal Theological School

On the Meaning of Christ. By John Knox. New York: Scribners, 1947, pp. xviii + 117. $2.50.

This book embodies the William Belden Noble Lectures which Professor Knox delivered at Harvard University last year. Its significance is to be found not in any strikingly new ideas or discoveries, but rather in that, in a skillful way, it gathers up and develops ideas current among the keenest of modern theologians, including—not least—ideas in Dr. Knox's earlier books. What the lecturer has done is to consider fully the problem that has faced the Church for these hundred years past: How is the Church to look at the inescapable fact of modern gospel study and at the same time to rediscover its unity in the living faith in God's revelation in Christ?

The present reviewer has never seen a more helpful or more persuasive answer to the problem. Lord Bacon remarked that some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested. Knox's book belongs to the third category. While it reads smoothly and easily, the reader will lose much if he follows the current custom of skimming through it and registering his general assent or dissent. He should make his own abstract of it, and go over the lectures again and again until he has mastered them. For only through following some such line of thought can the modern pastor be a guide to the perplexed. It is not too much to say that this is *practical theology*. If the ideas and attitudes contained herein can be made the basis of a system of religious education, it will do much to rid the Church of its nervous uncertainty in matters of faith and to stimulate Bible reading and biblical preaching.

A brief survey of the argument must be attempted. Knox begins by showing that, even for those who profess to disbelieve in the necessity of Christology, the lordship of Christ is the ground of the distinctiveness and unity of the Christian Church. Whether they realize it or not, all Christians who share the distinctive spiritual life which we call Christian do in fact stand under that lordship and owe their life to an historical revelation—not a body of information or indoctrination, but a revelatory event. The reality with which we have to deal can be looked at under three aspects: (*a*) the event or closely knit series of events in which God has made himself known; (*b*) the person who was the center of that event or complex of events; and (*c*) the community which came into being with the event and provided the locus of it. Of the three, event is the most appropriate and adequate category. It is the most inclusive; only through the event can one gain a true impression of the person; it is *par excellence* the historical category, and what we are seeking to interpret is preeminently an historical reality.

The event is of course related to all history, and especially to Hebrew-Christian history, but Jesus Christ is both the temporal center of the event and the center of its meaning. The event consists of several interdependent elements, all of which are essential: the personality, life and teaching of Jesus;

the response of loyalty which he awakened; his death and resurrection and the coming of the Spirit; the faith with which the Spirit was received; and the new community which was created. A clear realization of this truth "relieves us from excessive preoccupation with the insoluble and divisive problem of the 'nature' of Jesus." The Christology of the New Testament and the early Church was cast in terms of the decisive event through which the early Christians were living, and was concerned not so much with Jesus' nature as with his function and rôle. Dr. Knox comes out squarely for the Christology which we call Nicene or Chalcedonian, but warns that it must be put in its proper setting.

> In so far as these ancient answers have been divisive, they have been so, I should say, because many of those who accepted them as well as all those who have rejected them have failed to see their true intention. These answers are true not because they are metaphysically accurate descriptions of the nature of a person —how can we hope to define in this sense the nature of Christ when we have no idea how to define our own nature?—but because they are authentic and effective representations of the nature of an event. . . . They are thus true symbols of the meaning of Christ in the life and faith of the church; and, because they are *the* symbols historically developed to express that meaning, they can never be replaced. If Christians are ever to be united creedally, it will be upon the basis of these ancient creeds. But this can happen only if these creeds are recognized to be the symbols of God's revealing and saving *action*, not metaphysically accurate descriptions of the nature of His agent.

To look at the biblical revelation in terms of event also removes the feverish concern that is often felt lest this or that element of the gospel story should prove to be "unhistorical," for the real medium of the revelation is the event as a whole. Thus the response of the disciples to Jesus is itself a true part of the event; and, since the resurrection, and not merely the belief in it, is an objective fact, the authentic words and acts of Christ need not be limited to his "earthly," i.e. his pre-resurrection, life. Thus it comes about that the Fourth Gospel contains many true "words of Christ," though it also contains some of the prejudices and limitations of its author and the church of his time.

Finally, the "event-theology," if we may coin such a term, places the New Testament miracles in their true perspective. The resurrection, which is integral to the central event, is a mighty sign and symbol of the miraculous character of the event. While no believer in God can reject *a priori* the possibility of miracle, it should be remembered that the occurrence of each separate miracle is a strictly historical question, and that no miracle except the resurrection is essential to the event. Dr. Knox points out that St. Paul says nothing about miraculous elements in connection with Christ's ministry, and that in the gospels the miraculous continually grows. He is therefore inclined to reject the historicity of the miracles and to find their importance in the fact that they portray vividly and poetically the supreme significance of Christ.

From this point Dr. Knox goes on to discuss the place of "story" in the New Testament. One of the best and briefest examples of sacred story is to be found in Phil. 2:6–11, which alongside the historical contains "supra-historical" elements which belong to the realm of faith, though they are related to the revelation. A sacred "story" is true, just as *Hamlet* is true, because it expresses eternal truths. The "story" is

not an account of the event, but a representation of the *meaning* of the event. Like other biblical stories, the "story" of Christ's preëxistence, his ascension, and his second coming, sets forth an understanding of the relation in which God actually stands to human life, and it is true in that the understanding is correct. Since the meaning of the event as a whole, as it was realized and fulfilled in the experience of the community, is too great for merely historical terms to express, "story" is needed. It is important, however, that the Christian realize that it is "story" in which he believes; otherwise he becomes rigid and literalistic in his orthodoxy. Thus the Christian faith involves three elements: the actual history of the event, the ontological element (i.e. the reality of God himself), and the mythological element (i.e. the supra-historical features of the "story"). Gnostics deny that history is important for the gospel; materialists deny that there is any God; and fundamentalists that the gospel contains any "story." Thus all three either distort, or actually destroy, the faith.

The concluding lecture develops the theme that it is only in and through the Church that the revelation is known; thus the Church, when properly understood, is seen to be the most significant of all human communities.

The reviewer would dissent from Dr. Knox at only one point—his (apparently) sweeping denial of the historicity of the gospel miracles. The miraculous element undoubtedly grew; but Jesus' *healing* powers at least form an impressive part of the gospel story and are congruous with the rest of the picture. Jesus had to an unusual degree the power to rid men of their mental and physical ills, a power possessed in lesser measure by many others. Perhaps, as so often, the term "miracle" calls for further definition.

There are a few points that one would like to see developed further. One is the importance of Jesus' historical deeds and teachings; not in general, but in detail, for the specific emphases of his teaching, and their bearing on Christology, tend to be neglected even when due weight is given to the historical element. This was, of course, outside the scope of the present lectures. A related point is worth pondering: the historical Jesus as the center of meaning for the event as a whole. Unless this is clearly realized, the discoveries of modern New Testament study become meaningless and we have slipped into a neo-fundamentalism; i.e. everything in the Bible and the early Church is again on the same level. Historical study of the gospels has a very practical function: it gives us a relatively clear picture of Jesus, which in turn serves as a test by which we can evaluate the religious value of both the Hebrew-Jewish religion which preceded our Lord and the development of the Church afterward. Without it we could not say, as Knox rightly does, that the Fourth Gospel—and the Synoptics too—contain religiously valid sayings of the Risen Christ which can be distinguished from other sayings that are only human and fallible opinions. This kind of judgment demands the most delicate discrimination, but it is inescapable, for interpretations and judgments of one sort or another are always being made by exegetes and theologians, and that decision is best which rests on the most solid foundations. Nor is it mere "private interpretation," for it is hammered out in the public forum of discussion, in which students from all denominations participate.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Bible in the Church. A Short History of Interpretation. By Robert M. Grant. New York: Macmillan, 1948, pp. 194. $2.50.

It is not surprising that with the revival of interest in systematic or constructive theology attention should be directed toward the problem of the interpretation of the Scriptures. Rather, what surprises one is the fact that so few books on this subject have been published in the last decades in English. F. W. Farrar's *History of Iinterpretation* (1886) and G. H. Gilbert's *Interpretation of the Bible* (1908) were the last comprehensive treatments of this fundamental issue in English. Both are thoroughly antiquated. In Germany, Wilhelm Dilthey had posed the problem of the *understanding* of documents of the mind in the broadest sense and shown the origin of a theory of interpretation in philology, jurisprudence and theology (*Die Entstehung der Hermeneutik*, 1910). Which, if any, were the specific problems which confronted theological exegesis? That was the question on which hermeneutics of the 19th century was divided, as this reviewer has demonstrated (*Das Verstehen*, II). The answer to this question had to depend on the notion of the sources of authority, that is, on a theological decision. Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican, and Nonconformist hermeneutics can therefore not be identical.

Now a young Episcopalian scholar presents us with a brief history of the interpretation of the Bible in the Church. He deserves our thanks for undertaking this difficult task and for doing it well. However, the historical parts of the book are better than the sections in which systematical problems are touched upon. The weakest parts are the fundamental chapters I and XVI. It is not quite understandable why the author who is familiar with W. Dilthey's and our own studies in hermeneutics, and hence with the terminology employed in these works, can call his own book "really a sketch in hermeneutics" (p. 4). It is not a history of the theory but rather of the *practice* of interpretation or exegesis. (And I should not like to translate Dilthey's "Verstehen" by "divination" [p. 4], which has different connotations in English.)

The author says rightly: "Today it is our task to re-examine the methods of biblical interpretation and to test them anew" (p. 4); but it does not become quite clear whether he means the methods actually employed by the interpreters, or the hermeneutics. He is right in asking the question whether the historical method must be the only one which the church may employ. But what does it mean to say that the correct understanding of exegesis and its task is "that of Luther and . . . W. Dilthey" (p. 4)? Are the views of these two identical (p. 117)? The delineation of the nature and function of theological exegesis in the concluding chapter is not saitsfactory. A sharper analysis of the meaning of spiritual interpretation than the vague remarks on page 169 is necessary. What of the role of tradition in exegesis which the author does not seem to estimate too highly, as would appear from his treatment of interpretation in the earlier periods?

Whereas the systematical sections of the book lack precision and depth, the historical chapters which constitute its main portions do justice to the subject. The emphasis is upon the earlier history of exegesis. One hundred and eight pages are given to its development from Jesus' time to the Reformation, fifty-seven pages to modern times. Chapters II and III treat of Jesus' and Paul's use of the Old Testament. After discussing the use of the Old Testament in the New the author begins, with the fourth chapter, the history of interpretation of the Scriptures in the Christian Church (Marcion, Justin, Irenaeus who is "really the father of authoritative exegesis in the church," p. 57). Here the recent studies of H. de Lubacq on typology and allegory (*Recherches de science religieuse*, 1947) will prove helpful. Of the two schools treated in Chapters VI and VII, that of Alexandria and that of Antioch, the author seems to prefer the hermeneutics of the latter: "In the long run the literal-historical method became the principal exegetical method of the Christian Church" (p. 84). The chapter on the Middle Ages (IX) is very sketchy. We should have expected a more thorough treatment of Bernard's and especially of Hugh of St. Victor's theories and practices of interpretation. Who-

ever is familiar with the masterful analysis of Luther's hermeneutics by K. Holl will be somewhat disappointed with Grant's tenth chapter. No reference is made to spiritualistic (Schwenkfeld) and Anabaptist use of the Scriptures, though a great deal of new research has been done here of late. Rationalism is well presented in Chapter XI. The next section, discussing the 19th century, should have been divided into two parts, dealing with the first two-thirds and the last third separately. There is no mention of the influential "heilsgeschichtliche" Schule (von Hofmann) and its exegesis. One could question the author's judgment as to which works of interpretation have been and are especially significant in the light of today and tomorrow (Chap. XV). The crucial question will be: what are we primarily interested in; hermeneutics or the practice of exegesis? There are many works which contribute to the second and not much to the first, and, to a lessed extent, vice versa. If we want hermeneutics we shall have to articulate clearly the theological principles upon which it will have to be constructed.

In the bibliography I missed B. F. Westcott's *The Bible in the Church*, E. von Dobschütz's well-known *Vom Auslegen des Neuen Testaments*, E. Peterson, *Zum Problem der Bibelauslegung des Pietismus*—all important studies in the field of the history of interpretation.

Until a comprehensive treatment of the history of interpretation appears in English, this brief but compact survey of the development of exegesis in the Christian Church will well serve the purpose.

JOACHIM WACH

The University of Chicago

Das Leiden des Unschuldigen in Babylon und Israel. By Johann Jakob Stamm. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1946, pp. 83. Sw. Fr. 5.50.

Anciently, in Babylonia, suffering was regarded as punishment for sin, known or unknown, inflicted by some god. The suffering of the innocent thus posed a problem, which, however, the Babylonians never solved. At times they took refuge in the position that men cannot understand the plan of the gods, who, in any case, may have standards other than those of human society. This being the case, there was nothing to be done; one could only accept life as it was. At other times no attempt was made to face the difficulty intellectually; recourse was had to the established cult in the hope of persuading the gods to renewed affability. A third alternative was resort to magic of one kind or another.

In Israel suffering was believed to be sent by Jahveh, again as punishment for sin. In pre-exilic times the individual had no standing apart from the community. The suffering of the innocent, therefore, rarely presented a problem. The emergence of the individual during the exile, however, gave rise ultimately to questionings: Could God be just when the ungodly only too often enjoyed prosperity while the faithful suffered?

This was the problem faced by the authors of Psalms 49 and 73. They did not, however, solve it, for they lost sight of it as they pondered their newborn conviction of continued communion with God after death. In the Book of Job an answer to the problem is presented in the nature poems in the concluding chapters: There is a plan in the universe which man cannot understand. Nor can man understand why the innocent suffer. This resembles the Babylonian advice to accept the universe, with resignation. Nevertheless, there is a difference, for God is recognized as the Creator who is ever active in his world. It does not follow, therefore, from man's inability to find a reason for the suffering of the innocent that God is not just. Thus, though the problem remains unsolved on the human level, a new perspective is given and a new hope is born. Similarly the sceptical pessimism of Ecclesiastes is mitigated by his faith in God as Creator. It is true that the Babylonians too had a doctrine of divine creation, but their creator-god was far removed from, and had little concern with, the life of men.

It was Israel's faith in the Living God which made it possible for them to develop the idea that men occupying positions of leadership may be called upon to suffer as a sign to the community. The suffering of Moses and Elijah was of this kind. More significant was the suffering of Hosea and Jeremiah, upon whom pain was inflicted as a revelation to the people to whom they were sent. Nothing resembling this is found in Babylonian literature, for the

Babylonians had no concept of revelation, and so no prophets sent by God to reveal the meaning of history.

Finally, in Israel the idea of vicarious suffering emerged in the figure of the Suffering Servant (Isaiah 53), and, perhaps, in Zechariah 12:9–13:9. The Suffering Servant of his own free will responded to God's call to suffer on behalf of the covenant-community. His suffering, therefore, had meaning. In Babylonia the vicarious victim was substituted without regard to his will, much as some one was substituted for Jonathan in I Samuel 14:45. This threw no light upon the problem.

Dr. Stamm has convincingly presented his thesis that it was Israel's apprehension of God as the Creator who is constantly active in history, the Living God, which made it possible for them to find meaning in suffering as the Babylonians never did.

CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON
General Theological Seminary

The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets. By John Paterson. New York: Scribners, 1948, pp. 313. $3.00.

Scottish Old Testament scholarship has always managed to combine learning with piety and to present the results of serious research in forms that would be useful to the preacher and the average Christian. George Adam Smith is, of course, the great exemplar. The present volume, by a pupil of a more recent generation of Scottish scholars, is evidence that the gift has not been lost, and those who still cherish their copies of "Isaiah" and "The Book of the Twelve Prophets" in the *Expositor's Bible* will find here nutriment exactly suited to their taste. Professor Paterson, who is a member of the faculty of Drew Seminary, has produced a series of studies dealing with all the prophetic books of the Old Testament, in order, as he says, "to mediate to the student of Scripture the sound results of Bible study," and has succeeded admirably in that purpose. The style is clear and incisive, often witty, and occasionally rhetorical in a pleasant if somewhat old-fashioned way. Since the writer's aim was to bring the prophets to life and to show the astonishing vitality and originality of their teaching, the discussion of literary-critical and historical questions has been reduced to the bare minimum necessary for understanding the men and the books in which their messages are incorporated.

As is appropriate with a book of this kind, the point of view in general and upon specific issues is in accord with the common sense of modern Old Testament scholarship and the reader need not be afraid that he is being offered the eccentric views of a particular writer as though they were self-evident or commonly accepted conclusions. The analysis of the books of the prophets and the opinions regarding date and authorship are those which are familiar to most recent seminary graduates and even with regard to the Book of Ezekiel, currently the most debated part of the prophetic literature, the author is content to accept the conservative view, although, with the majority of recent commentators, he rejects chapters 38–39, and acknowledges the presence in chapters 40–48 of considerable secondary material which has accumulated around an original genuine nucleus. Among other opinions, it may be noted that he regards the great prophets as in some degree ecstatics, denies that they were in any sense founders of a new religion, accepts the view that they were primarily forth-tellers rather than fore-tellers, and rejects the once popular view that the pre-exilic prophets were exclusively prophets of doom. The Anglican reader will be gratified by the appreciative treatment of ecclesiastically and sacramentally minded prophets such as Ezekiel and Haggai.

The chief defect of the book is one which arises out of its conservative acceptance of the philosophy and presuppositions of an older generation of scholarship. In common with almost all modern treatments of the subject, it approaches the prophets atomistically, seeing them as "religious geniuses," "great leaders" and "personalities," rather than as instruments in the hands of the God of history. Hence one misses any sense of the unity and majestic sweep of the prophetic movement as a whole. The final chapter is appropriately entitled "Christ: the Goal of Prophecy," but, devout and suggestive as it is, it seems rather an afterthought than an organic part of the work. As a result of the new theological tendencies of the present day it is to be hoped that some one will feel impelled to write a new *kind* of book on the prophets, one which will treat them,

not simply as interesting personalities with acute insights, but as integral parts of that mighty stream of history through which God has made known His Word to man—which culminated in the Word made Flesh.

ROBERT C. DENTAN
Berkeley Divinity School

Kingship and the Gods. By Henri Frankfort. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948, pp. xxvi + 444. $5.00.

"The ancient Near East considered kingship the very basis of civilization. Only savages could live without a king. Security, peace, and justice could not prevail without a ruler to champion them. If ever a political institution functioned with the assent of the governed, it was the monarchy which built the pyramids with forced labor and drained the Assyrian peasantry by ceaseless wars" (p. 3). This assent—to the institution, not necessarily, it may be noted, to the specific actions or policies of the reigning sovereign—was forthcoming, Mr. Frankfort argues, because it was believed that it was through the king that harmony between human existence and the supernatural order was maintained.

In Egypt the king was regarded as a god, and the kingship as the channel through which the powers of nature flowed into the body politic to bring human endeavor to fruition. This belief, which maintained itself even in periods of political and social disorder, Mr. Frankfort traces to its origin, and examines certain of the art-forms and texts—both myth and ritual—in which it found expression. He then describes the functioning of kingship, the measures taken to meet the crisis occasioned by the death of the king—the funeral rites of the dead sovereign and the coronation of his successor—and the labyrinthine relationships of the Pharaoh to the many gods of Egypt.

The same method of investigation is followed in dealing with Mesopotamia. There the king was rarely regarded as a god—and then only by elevation. He was the appointee of the gods, and to him was committed the task of maintaining "the natural harmony . . . by watching the service of the gods and attuning the life of the community to such portents as were vouchsafed to him as revelations of the divine will" (pp. 309f). It was an onerous and anxious task, for the gods of Mesopotamia were capricious, in this reflecting the capriciousness of nature in that harsh land. In Egyptian thought, on the other hand, the universe was an ordered universe, occasionally disturbed, but never deeply, by the forces of chaos—an interesting instance of the effect of topography and climate upon theology.

In an epilogue a third kind of king, found in the peripheral regions of the ancient Near East, is described—the "hereditary leader whose authority was derived from descent and was originally coextensive with kinship" (p. 337). The kingship in Israel was of this type. It was never thought of as descended from heaven. "The transcendentalism of Hebrew religion prevented kingship from assuming the profound significance which it possessed in Egypt and Mesopotamia. It excluded, in particular, the king's being instrumental in the integration of society and nature. . . . The Hebrew king, as every other Hebrew, stood under the judgment of God in an alien world" (pp. 343f).

Mr. Frankfort writes with clarity and distinction—there is not an obscure sentence in the book—and his treatment of his material is penetrating and sympathetic. His study, he states explicitly, is not chronological but "phenomenological . . . a 'systematic discussion of what appears'" (p. vii). This reviewer has not the competence to make a critical appraisal of his presentation of Egyptian and Mesopotamian ideas, or to determine the extent to which his disregard of chronological considerations has affected his conclusions. In his brief discussion of Hebrew kingship his failure to distinguish between source documents has resulted in his interpreting I Samuel 9:15–16 in the light of 8:19–20, and so, it would seem, in his underestimating the degree of divine authority claimed for the monarchy in at least one period of Israel's history. It might be suggested, further, that he has allowed too little significance to the claims made for the house of David; Isaiah 7:3–9 is relevant here, and the Chronicler's interest in David. Nor is there any reference in the book to the traces in the Old Testament of the pre-exilic observance of the New Year's Festival as the Enthronement of Jahveh. The role played by the king on this occasion in Mesopotamia makes it not unlikely that he took

some part in the Jerusalem rite. Would not this have influenced the development of the idea of kingship?

Mr. Frankfort would thus seem to have made a little too sharp the very real contrast between Hebrew thought, on the one hand, and that of Egypt and Mesopotamia, on the other, and that not only as regards kingship, but also as regards the harmonious integration of man's life with the life of nature. The implications of such passages as Isaiah 11:6–9, 55:12–13, Ezekiel 34:25–27 must not be overlooked. It is true that "the absolute transcendence of God is the foundation of Hebrew religious thought. God is absolute, unqualified, ineffable, transcending every phenomenon, the one and only cause of all existence. God, moreover, is holy, which means that all values are ultimately his." It may be questioned, however, whether as a consequence "every concrete phenomenon is devaluated" (p. 343).

One could not ask for a more understanding or a more stimulating presentation of the true values of Egyptian and Mesopotamian religion than Mr. Frankfort has provided. In Egypt, especially, there is an awareness of grace—though the word, of course, is never used—mediated through a person to actualize the unity of life. The trouble was that it was all too easy: there was little real consciousness of sin. In Mesopotamia men knew the disorder in the universe, but, since the gods were regarded as capricious, the measures taken to remedy this were without moral significance. But these values and insights were not lacking in the religion of Israel, though they were very differently expressed, and the fact of sin was taken seriously. What is needed to make this clear is a study of the Old Testament as penetrating and sympathetic as this study of the documents of two of the religions which influenced Israel.

CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON
General Theological Seminary

Ugaritic Mythology. By Julian Overmann. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948, pp. 110. $2.75.

During the last quarter of a century a new forgotten kingdom has been recovered. The first step in this, the most recent triumph of modern archaeological research, was made in 1929 by Claude Schaeffer, Associate Curator of the Museum of St. Germain-en-Laye, near Paris. The place excavated was a mound at Ras es Shamra, on the Syrian coast about ten miles north of Latakia, the ancient Laodicea. This spot, which archaeologists now call Ras Shamra, is known to have been the site of the capital of the Kingdom of Ugarit, which flourished fifteen centuries before our era.

Besides the usual materials found on ancient sites, a large number of clay tablets covered by well-known cuneiform script came to light. But the writing was not syllabic, as that of the usual users of cuneiform, but alphabetic. In short, an alphabet consisting of twenty-nine cuneiform signs, or letters, was used, and the language written in these letters was a Semitic one, closely related to Hebrew. Thus there have been brought to light a new system of writing, a new literature, and a new culture. Most of the literature is religious—of the religion of Baal—and is of prime value in the study of the Old Testament. Indeed a whole book has already been written on parallels in this literature to our Book of Psalms.

The book before us for review is only a partial analysis of the mythological narrative of the so-called Anat Poem, or what it really turns out to be, the narrative of a building saga. It is thus a study of merely a fragment, though a very important one, of Ugaritic mythological material. Indeed Professor Overmann's sub-title more correctly defines the contents of his book than the main title—both titles reading: *Ugaritic Mythology, A Study of its Leading Motifs.* The book is therefore not really a systematic study of Ugaritic mythology as one may be led to infer by the main title.

The chief characters in this mythological narrative are almost all names well known to students of Semitic religion, namely, Baal and his father El, his mother Athirat, his sister Anat, and an Egyptian master-builder, with a Semitic name, Hayin, etc. The motive which dominates this particular saga is that of an alliance-enmity, and the subject is the way in which Baal intrigued to get the permission of El to enable him to build a costly house for himself—as Solomon built in Jerusalem. In studying the motive, the author has given a transliteration and translation of the main text, together with those of other parallels. The

whole work is scholarly, reliable, and indispensable to students of Semitic religion and of mythology in general.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER
Trinity College in the University of Toronto

The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel. By I. G. Matthews. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947, pp. xiv + 304. $4.00.

This history of the religion of Israel opens with an introductory chapter on the meaning of religion. Following this the author treats of Semitic religion in its desert setting—one of the best chapters in the book. He then passes to a consideration of the specifically Israelite tradition of Yahweh, which he believes to have originated at Sinai subsequent to the exodus. An excellent description of the religion of Canaan is followed by an account of its effect upon the religion of the invading Israelites. The rise of the monarchy and its influence upon Yahwism, manifested chiefly in the building of the temple of Solomon and its ritual, are then discussed, and this is followed by a chapter covering the period between the two Jeroboams. This leads up to a consideration of eighth century prophecy, which passes into an evaluation of the deuteronomic movement. The succeeding chapters deal with the recognition of the worth of the individual by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the affirmation of monotheism by Deutero-Isaiah, and the emergence and development of the concept of wisdom—bracketed together as the religion of the intellectuals—the restoration of the temple and the adoption of the Priest Code, the religion and ethics of the sages, messianism and apocalypticism, and Judaism.

Dr. Matthews is thoroughly conversant with recent trends in Old Testament scholarship. He has, nevertheless, for the most part, adhered to the commonly accepted critical positions of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Consequently, his treatment of the extraordinarily important period between the fall of Samaria and the rise of Alexander the Great contains little that is new. Accepting as historical in practically all its details the account of the promulgation of the Code of Deuteronomy in II Kings 22–23, he perforce passes over in silence the influence of the north in the religious and theological development from the seventh to the fourth centuries, and fails to recognize that the problem of the relationship of the individual to the group was complicated by the conflict between Jerusalem and Shechem, which continued even after the adoption of the Priest Code.

The author's point of view is that of liberal protestantism, and his book reveals both the strength and the limitations of that position. It insists on the worth of the individual, but its recognition of the reality of the community is scarcely adequate. Hence, it acclaims, rightly, the prophetic criticism of the priest, but it nowhere evinces a real appreciation of the latter's contribution to Israel's religious development. Again, it takes full account of the human forces at play in that development —Israel's progress is a pilgrimage, the result of man's search for God. Of God's effective search for man it has little to say. The author is impatient of particularism, of the idea that God chose Israel. His definition of revelation is that it was "a vital process developing in history by means of that intelligence that in ever widening horizons contributed to the better solution of the problems of human existence" (p. 6). But where does the process begin? Again, speaking of the eighth century prophets, he says, "The visions they saw (Amos 7:1–9; Isa. 6:1–12a) and the voices they heard came through personal reflections on everyday experiences, rather than from the heavens; and their phrases, 'Oracle of Yahweh,' and 'Thus saith Yahweh,' were their inner convictions that such was right, couched in the stock phrases of the day, rather than the claim to the supernatural" (pp. 131 f).

Despite these defects Dr. Matthews has made a worth-while contribution to the study of the Old Testament. The book is stimulating, a delight to read because of the clarity of its style, and a most useful work of reference because of its careful and exhaustive documentation.

C. A. SIMPSON
The General Theological Seminary

The Groundwork of the Gospels. By R. O. P. Taylor. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946, pp. xiii + 151. 7s. 6d.

The late R. O. P. Taylor, though he held no academic appointment, succeeded in combining with his pastoral ministry certain careful and

devoted investigations in the field of New Testament scholarship. He possessed a sound classical background and pursued his own way through the literature of the early Christian Church, seeking to draw attention to points of interest and importance which might be overlooked in the more general reconstructions of his time. Perhaps there is little in his writings which can be regarded as altogether original, and yet there is a freshness—almost a subdued excitement—in his researches which make the reader feel that the matters to which he draws attention must at least be given serious consideration and may be of real importance for a true understanding of the genesis and development of the literature of the New Testament.

The Groundwork of the Gospels consists in the main of an attempt to show that although the first of our written Gospels did not appear until more than a generation after the Crucifixion, yet oral records "were fashioned long before the actual writing of Mark, and that such a watch was kept on them that they retained their form, so that they were therefore reliable. What Mark wrote down was not a new composition. . . . It was a long-existent, accredited record made by one of the principal actors in the history" (i.e. Peter). With this object in view, Dr. Taylor examines in detail such questions as the relation of Mark to Peter, the character of Mark's own ministry, the nature of our Lord's teaching, the place of the Gospels in primitive worship, the educational methods employed in Greek circles in the first century of our era, and finally the question of whether our Lord spoke Greek as well as Aramaic. Though the earlier chapters move a little slowly, after a while the reader's interest is gripped and the accumulation of evidence is seen to carry considerable weight and cogency. How far Dr. Taylor's conclusions will be acceptable to experts I cannot say. But if only for his vivid reminder to us that to the early disciples and indeed to the early Church "the living Word was a spoken word," we can well be grateful to the author for bringing to our attention a side of things which we tend to forget because of our immersion in modern attitudes and customs.

Three final papers have been added on *The Paracletes*, *The Accuser*, and *Outsiders*. These are valuable word-studies of important New Testament terms, the first being the longest and probably the most significant. It includes interesting side-lights on the career of Barnabas and inclines strongly to the tradition which accounts him the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Altogether this is a book which can be read with interest and profit by the non-technical reader, and which at the same time contains suggestions worthy of consideration by the scholar and specialist.

F. W. DILLISTONE
Episcopal Theological School

Jesus: What Manner of Man. By Henry J. Cadbury. New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. xi + 123. $2.25.

As a New Testament scholar Professor Cadbury is best known for his investigations in Luke-Acts and for his *Peril of Modernizing Jesus* (1937). But his influence is not mediated by these books alone. As Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard and as chairman of the American Friends Service Committee, he plays a significant rôle in American Protestantism. And the ideas which he sets forth on the life and teaching of Jesus come to be held by many who may never have seen his books.

The reason for pointing out this fact is that Professor Cadbury's place in New Testament studies is very similar to that of G. G. Coulton in medieval scholarship. Consider this statement (*Fourscore Years*, p. 349):

> I felt, and feel still, that there was much unreality in the work that was being done on the Middle Ages, and even, in some conspicuous cases, scandalous literary dishonesty under the excuse of religious conviction. It was difficult, therefore, to avoid that my own books, taken by themselves, should give something of a one-sided picture.

This is Dr. Cadbury's attitude, as he explicitly sets it forth in *The Peril of Modernizing Jesus*, where he compares his viewpoint to the use of corrective lenses in eye-glasses. He wishes to correct both orthodox and "modern" distortions. And no one is more aware of the danger of self-deception than is Cadbury himself. As he points out (*Peril*, pp. 26 f), scholarly analysis of the gospels often tends to discount apocalyptic and miraculous elements; our contrast of original and secondary elements "corresponds with suspicious accuracy

to the contrast between modern preferences and modern aversions."

There is no need to go through the book and pick out items for praise or blame. Professor Cadbury is too able a scholar for such piecework to be of value. Moreover, as Rabbi La'zar said (Pirke Aboth, iv. 17), "Let the fear of thy master be as the fear of Heaven." What is significant is Cadbury's point of view, and the correction of the exaggerations of others. For this purpose both *Peril* and *Jesus* are invaluable. Preachers should read them before making generalizations. And while every generation will, and should, modernize Jesus, following the example of the Fourth Gospel, its reading of Cadbury will keep its eyes open, and perhaps corrected as well.

His chapter on the parables is an excellent example of freshness and originality. It has become conventional to say that the parables do not stress growth and development. Cadbury (p. 39) simply points out that this is not the case. Another feature which he notes is that of "the absence of God" (p. 45). Here he is surely right, and far less sentimental than those who constantly point to the "comforting presence." And (to my mind) he is on firm theological ground when he observes that "religious experience as distinct from science" confirms these views (p. 47).

The first chapter deals with various modern character-descriptions, such as questionnaires. Is not a little modernizing present here? Or should we not suspect the presence of a slightly sardonic humor when Cadbury suggests that Jesus might teach in a divinity school and occupy the chair of Old Testament or that of Ethics (p. 2)? On p. 8 he complains of Rawlinson's *Christ in the Gospels* as giving "hardly a hint of normal human behavior." Is this a submerged apologetic motive? Must Jesus always be normal, and the early church, in interpreting him, abnormal? But again Cadbury is stressing an element which others fail to recognize.

Is it always possible to discover what Jesus himself was like or what he taught? On p. 97 the closing words of the parable of Dives and Lazarus are used to suggest that the church did not greatly value the resurrection as evidence for Jesus' significance. Do not the words "if they do not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone should rise from the dead" really reflect Christian awareness that in fact the Jews do not read the Old Testament typologically (2 Cor. 3:15) and have not been convinced by the resurrection? And does not Cadbury's judgment reflect his own lack of concern with the resurrection? To say this is not to claim that it was Jesus' major interest.

Theological students and teachers, who often pride themselves on their conservatism, whether ecclesiastical or academic, need the insights which Cadbury's independent mind can give them. No student should pass through seminary without contact with his books. His ideas need not be taken as scripture; he himself would repudiate such use of them. But here, as in his other work, we are confronted with clear, vigorous and uncompromising New Testament scholarship as well as with a lively interest in its religious significance.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of the South

John the Universal Gospel. By Chester Warren Quimby. New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. 224 + xiv. $2.75.

This book should prove stimulating, informative and devotionally helpful to the thoughtful lay reader (as well as lay reader in the more technical sense). It may appeal also to many a busy preacher. Nevertheless this reviewer is inclined to regard it as offering a too fully predigested interpretation of the Fourth Gospel for the clergyman who seriously sets about to expound its great themes. In the first place, to such a reader much of the first half of the book, devoted to the historical background, authorship, purpose and peculiarities of this Gospel, should be more than familiar through long study of weightier treatments of the subject. (Surely the comparison of the cry of the Ephesians in Acts 19:34 to a modern college football cheer, p. 11, is more cleverly amusing than genuinely instructive!) The second half of the book is an exposition, chapter by chapter, of the message of the Gospel. Here there is a great deal that is highly suggestive and useful, which the preacher might well use as a match to kindle his own fires. One must however question the accuracy of several points made by the author. One alone will suffice here. It is the statement apropos of the Prologue:

"There must be a way for God to get in touch with man. That method the Jews termed 'Wisdom,' the Greeks, 'Logos' or the Word. In both cases God was thought of as transcendent and beyond the reach of man, yet active in the affairs of man" (p. 95).

To interpret the Greek philosophic concept of *logos* as "the Word," as is here done, implies a Speaker, a personal Deity. Yet among the Stoics who made most use of this concept, *logos* is simply "reason," an impersonal principle immanent in (not transcendent above) the universe and man. The idea of the word of God as the means of creation and revelation is not Greek but Jewish, being found in the Old Testament, in Ps. 33:6, Is. 2:1, Jer. 2:1 and elsewhere. But it is incorrect to infer that the Jews thought of God as "beyond the reach of man," as was conclusively demonstrated by G. F. Moore in his monumental work on Judaism (vol. I, pp. 422 ff). While it may be objected that such technical points as these have no place in a popular exposition, there is no excuse for statements which in effect are positive misinterpretations of the thought lying behind the important Logos doctrine of John, the Universal Gospel.

OSCAR J. F. SEITZ

Bexley Hall, Kenyon College

The Jesus of the Parables. By Charles W. F. Smith. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1948, pp. 348. $3.00.

Without the resurrection the parables of Jesus would not have been preserved, but without the parables Jesus would not have been crucified. In other words, the author of this excellent new study of the parables holds that the opponents of Jesus responded to him as they did because they understood him better, in some respects, than his own followers. Thus the parables were not, as the Marcan theory has it, esoteric devices for concealing the true meaning of Jesus but, on the contrary, pointed illustrations for making that meaning inescapably clear. Jesus was not crucified for telling "pleasant stories to enforce prudential morality." His parables were "the chief weapon he resorted to when attacked . . . and his usual response to attack was to assume the offensive." Consequently the parables must be understood, not as the dispassionate product of the classroom, but instruments of debate having direct relation to the activity of Jesus in confronting his people with the decisions demanded by the critical situation of his day. The refusal of Israel to accept the insistent demands voiced in the parables brought Jesus to the cross.

Between this mission of Jesus to his people of which the parables were the instrument and the writing of the Gospels in which those parables were preserved there intervened an experience of his followers which made them see him and his teaching in a new light. It is the post-resurrection viewpoint of the early Church which creates the problem and the necessity of Gospel criticism. As the parables were employed for the new purposes of mission-preaching and apologetic to Gentiles and for the instruction of converts they were interpreted in ways which tended to obscure and alter the original intention of Jesus in telling them. The commonest method by which this was done was allegorizing details which are important only to give the story reality or verisimilitude and thus to make clear the single central point which the parable was intended to emphasize.

The mission of Jesus was confined to his own people, not because he had no interest in the outside world, but because Israel itself must be made to realize its missionary task. Thus the parables were directed to the historical situation which then faced Israel, and can be understood correctly only with reference to that situation. This, however, does not limit their applicability to the time for which they were first spoken, for the original purpose of Jesus in the parables was to force the religious community of his day to undergo searching self-criticism in the light of its divine vocation. This fact alone, remembered and properly appreciated, gives the parables particular relevance as a warning to the Church in every new age. "When we recover the directness of the application of the parables to the historic Israel, we recover the duty to apply them to 'the people of God' before we apply them to 'those outside.'"

When the original occasion of the parables passed, the words might have passed also. The reason they have not passed is that Jesus has not passed. "He always confronts the Church as once he confronted it in the flesh. Before we can apply his words to the Church and

world as we know them we must get back as near as possible to him." The first hearers of Jesus, friends and foes as well, found it increasingly impossible to separate the message from the messenger, the demand from him who made it. Yet the parables, full of God and His kingdom, have nothing directly to say of the Messiah, and about his own person Jesus was strangely silent. The cure for sentimentality in the presentation of Jesus, this author concludes, is to know him as he appears in the parables, not as an Eastern sage or moralist, or as the passive victim of circumstance or preordained plan, but as the active doer of God's perfect will in the face of opposition and death. Rejected by his people, misunderstood even by his followers, "the remnant is reduced to one. The Israel of God takes on individual form. Obedience is found in a single person."

Into the development of the general thesis, as here summarized from the two opening chapters and the final chapter of the book, the author has woven five intervening sections devoted to the detailed discussion and interpretation of about forty parables classified according to their common themes. Here the author strictly applies two main principles: (1) The principle, first stated with such clarity by Jülicher in 1888, that there is but one central point in each parable. (2) The principle that all the parables originally applied to the community of Israel in the historic crisis of Jesus' own day. It will not be surprising if the author's judgment concerning the main point and original application of certain parables meets with considerable disagreement. For instance, is the real clue to Mark 4:1–9 the observation that "in spite of the inevitable loss of some of the seed . . . the sower finds it worthwhile, abundantly worthwhile to sow his seed year after year, persistently!" Although the interpreter repeatedly asserts that this is a parable of *persistence*, that is a point of which the parable itself makes no mention, since it speaks of the sowing of only a single season with no reference to its annual repetition. The clue to the parable seems rather to be the fruitful increase of the seed when it falls upon good soil. The question is not unimportant since it affects vitally the meaning which we are to attach to the parable in question.

Less important no doubt is the difference of opinion which might arise over whether a particular saying of Jesus should be classified as a parable or not. For example, why should it be said that the story of the rich fool in Luke 12:16–20 "is not strictly a parable at all," and why should the sayings in Mt. 5:25–26; Lk. 12:58–59 be called parables? Likewise, one cannot help asking whether the application given to certain parables is not somewhat strained in the interest of the author's theory that every parable must originally have referred to the community of Israel, rather than to the more individual and personal relationships of life. Nevertheless, this approach to the mission and message of Jesus as contained in the parables is exceedingly refreshing and valuable, and merits careful consideration by scholar and preacher alike. If for the latter it proves somewhat upsetting to his customary homiletical interpretation of the parables, that effect, plainly intended by the author, should be highly salutary to preacher and hearer alike.

OSCAR J. F. SEITZ

Bexley Hall

Das Leben des Herrn in der Gemeinde und ihren Diensten. By Eduard Schweizer. (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, ed. W. Eichrodt and O. Cullmann, Nr. 8.) Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1946, pp. 152. Fr. Swiss 8.50.

This little work bears the subtitle: "Eine Untersuchung der neutestamentlichen Gemeindeordnung." It is, however, not so much an investigation as a theological essay—almost, indeed, a sermon—on the New Testament conception of the ministry. For his text, the writer has chosen to employ Romans 4:24–25: "Jesus our Lord . . . who was delivered for our offences, and was raised for our justification." In the context in which St. Paul introduces them, these words have no relation to the doctrine of the ministry, but Schweizer has carved from them a convenient series of pegs for the several aspects of the nature and function of the ministry which he wishes to hold before our attention. He insists that "ecclesiology" can never be divorced from Christology, and that the work of the ministry and even the form under which it is exercised

can be properly understood only when it is seen to be a manifestation of the crucified and living Lord who is always present in the church which is his body.

The author is a highly competent New Testament scholar, and handles his materials with discrimination and skill. For Anglo-Saxon readers, the interest of his book is somewhat lessened by the fact that it moves almost exclusively within the field of modern German controversy; while there are very full references to recent German literature, his acquaintance with works written in English seems to be confined to Lock's commentary on the Pastorals and a few of the essays in Dunkerley's symposium on *The Ministry and the Sacraments*. Particular attention is given to the criticism of the views of Harnack and Sohm, and to the controversy with Rome; Anglicanism is mentioned only incidentally in three footnotes.

FRANK W. BEARE

Trinity College, Toronto

Die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments. Erwachsenen- und Kindertaufe. By Oscar Cullmann. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948, pp. 76. Sw. Fr. 5.50.

Professor Cullmann of Basel has been led to a thorough investigation of primitive Christian baptism by the discussion aroused by Professor Karl Barth's *Kirchliche Lehre von der Taufe*. He builds upon and goes beyond Professor Joachim Jeremias's important work, *Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt?* (1938; see A.T.R., XXVII [1945] 259). He points out the close connection between forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit, in Christian baptism (certainly throughout the N.T.), and holds that the latter is not merely something added to the old (Jewish? Johannine?) baptism of immersion for the forgiveness of sins; there is in it something new, which is closely related to and dependent upon the Work of Christ. Christ's work began with His own baptism, in which as the Son of God foretold in II Isaiah He then took upon himself the redemptive task described in Isa. 53. As our Lord's work, initiated by His Baptism, was accomplished apart from the faith of those who were to be baptized into Him, so the baptism of individuals does not require a full and explicit faith in advance of their reception of the sacrament.

The conclusions relating to faith and baptism are as follows (p. 49): (1) *after* baptism, faith is required of all the baptized; (2) *before* baptism, the affirmation of faith is a sign of the divine will that the Church should undertake the administration of the sacrament, and is required of *adults* who come over as individuals from Judaism or heathenism; in other cases the requirement is absent; (3) during the act of Baptism faith is required on the part of the praying community.

As for the baptism of children (p. 64), there is no direct evidence in the N.T. but only indirect testimony. It is, however, completely compatible with the doctrine of Baptism as set forth in scripture. The author hesitates to insist fully upon this principle, since (apparently following Jewish practice of circumcision and baptism of proselytes' children) the evidence seems to him to show that baptism was not required of adults whose parents were, at the time of their birth (the children's birth) already believing Christians. Naturally, such cases were possible only in the very latest period of N.T. history. And here, it seems to me, we begin to run into other evidence, outside the N.T., which points in the opposite direction.

There is an interesting Appendix (reprinted from the *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* (Strasbourg, 1937, 424ff)) on "Traces of an Ancient Baptismal Formula in the N.T." The author studies Ac 8:36, 10:47, 11:17, Mt 3:14, Eb Evg (Epiphanius 30.13) where the verb "hinder" occurs, and concludes that this reflects a part of the early formula —somewhat as in the marriage service! He thinks the formula ("What hinders, that so-and-so should be baptized?" Ans.: "Nothing hinders," or "It is lawful"—*nihil obstat!*) came in from Jewish Christianity, where it had to be made certain that a man was already circumcized before he could receive Christian baptism. An interesting hypothesis.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Union Theological Seminary

Die urchristliche Mission: Voraussetzungen, Motive und Methoden. By Rudolf Liechtenhan. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1946, pp. 98. Fr. 7.80.

Unsatisfied with Harnack's thesis that Jesus himself planned no Gentile-mission and with Bultmann's arguments against the authenticity of Mt. 16:17–19, the author begins with a discussion of that passage. The question, he holds, is not whether Jesus actually used some Aramaic equivalent of "ecclesia," but whether the entity denoted by it, viz. a community of disciples, had a place in his work. While he admits that vs. 19 disagrees with the facts in Mk. 10:38ff, 9:34ff, 38ff, Liechtenhan makes a valiant effort to salvage from this saying to Peter about the church some historical kernel. He believes—and this is perhaps the weakest link in his thesis—that a more original form of the same tradition is preserved in Lk. 22:31. This saying, although it lacks the name of honor, Cephas-Peter, promises that after his recovery from the attack of Satan (cf. the "gates of hades" in Mt.!), Simon will be established as the leader of his brethren for the continuation of his Lord's work. Moreover, the setting of this saying in Luke, as part of the farewell discourse, means that it originated at a time when Jesus was already faced with rejection by his people and with the attendant necessity of providing for the "little flock" which is to inherit the kingdom.

To enlarge that little flock Jesus had sent out the twelve to gather in the "lost sheep" of the house of Israel. But the command, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles," applied only to the immediate activity of the apostles during Jesus' life-time. Even Jesus himself conferred healing upon non-Jews and it is impossible to draw a sharp line between the healings and the proclamation, since both draw men into the sphere of God's sovereignty. Besides, it is not the house of Israel as a whole which is named as the object of the mission, but rather its lost sheep, i.e. those excluded by its official representatives. It is God's will to over-rule the verdict of ecclesiastics with sovereign magnanimity, and this is precisely the work of Jesus. In this connection Liechtenhan lays considerable weight upon the traditions preserved in such sayings as Lk. 4:16–27, 13:28–30, 14:16–24; Mk. 12:1–12, which hint that salvation, rejected by the people to whom it was originally promised, will now be offered to those outside. Indeed, if Jesus viewed his task as that of the Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah—and this is to be maintained according to Liechtenhan—then he must be the "light of the Gentiles" who belong to the "many" for whom he gives his life as a ransom. While the immediate consequence of his rejection by Israel is not the mission to the Gentiles but his death which ratifies the new covenant, that covenant includes not merely the twelve table-companions at the Supper but the "many" to whom they are thus obligated to extend it. And if, in its present redaction, Mt. 28:16–20 is secondary, still the appearances of the risen Christ were appeals for the continuation of his work, as is shown by the testimony of Paul; according to 1 Cor. 9:1, vision and vocation to the mission coincide.

But first the primitive community of disciples had to fulfill its work among its own nation. However, since Israel had joined with the Gentiles against the Servant of the Lord, it had ceased to be a community destined for salvation (*Heilsgemeinde*). Admission to the kingdom, therefore, now results from the decisive acts of individuals: repentance and baptism, which so far as the Jew is concerned means an act of "de-solidarization" from the guilty nation. Consequently Paul was bound to oppose the demand for the circumcision of Gentile converts; why should they desire admission to a people already under divine judgment only to "de-solidarize" themselves from it again by baptism? Paul's opponents might argue that circumcision admits one not merely to the nation but to the old covenant, which only Israel, not God, had broken, a covenant not abolished but rather continued in the new. Yet the events of history were against them, for God himself granted his Spirit to the uncircumcised. Nevertheless, the missionary task was from the first never simply a matter of the conversion of individuals but always included their incorporation into the new *Heilsgemeinde*, the Church. As Liechtenhan well puts it, the question whether one could remain a Christian apart from the Church simply did not exist; modern individualism was unthinkable in the primitive age. Together the members of the body of Christ are charged with responsibility for the mission; together

they accept the task of shining as light in a dark world. The missionary functions of the charismatic endowments (esp. 1 Cor. 12–14) are ably discussed in the concluding pages.

Such in brief is the thesis of this interesting and stimulating study. That the thesis is not without some serious defects in detail does not obscure the numerous constructive contributions of the author, most of which could not even be mentioned in a bare résumé. One regrets that lack of space forbids quoting in full an exalted passage at the end of Ch. 8 (p. 75) which pictures Paul the missionary as one overwhelmed by the irresistible power of an infinitely high and holy Will, yet of an intimate Spirit, the power of a compassionate Love which seeks and realizes fellowship with man in all his need and guilt and becomes in the man who is apprehended by it a never-resting energy and devotion. For one comes away from the New Testament convinced that it is that Spirit which is the secret to any understanding of the success of the primitive Christian mission.

OSCAR J. F. SEITZ

Bexley Hall

Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. By Harry Austryn Wolfson. Two vols. Harvard University Press, 1947, pp. xvi + 462, xiv + 531. $10.00.

In 1934 Professor Wolfson published his work on *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, in which he showed how that philosophy rejected the fundamental principles which had been accepted for the preceding seventeen centuries, viz. a system based on revelation. Since the publication of that study, he has been working back through these seventeen centuries to the stage where the system first emerges. That point he believes to be represented by Philo, for whom revelation and reason were certainly correlative, comparable, and capable of unification. What Professor Wolfson now proposes to do is trace the history of this "mediaeval" system as it stretches from Philo to Spinoza, a system taken for granted by almost all philosophers, Jewish and Moslem as well as Christian—the last chapter in the present work sketches its main outlines. In this proposed series, the present two volumes on Philo are the second book—the first will presumably be a general introductory study of Greek philosophy; later volumes will study post-Philonic philosophers, and the series will conclude with a revised and expanded edition of the book on Spinoza.

The present work is a vast and amply documented survey of Philo's thought. It is not enough, in expounding Philo, simply to select a few great passages (on God, Logos, Eternity of the World, etc.) and explain these; for Philo is a preacher, and never tells all in any one passage; he is fragmentary, and his primary purpose is to expound scripture—the result is that if one wishes to discover the Philonic system underlying this scattered exegesis and these fragmentary homilies, he must take into account a hundred passages, and supply more than one missing link by hypothesis and inference. I think no one has ever penetrated the labyrinthine depths of Philo's philosophy more deeply than Professor Wolfson. Some writers have dismissed the suggestion that Philo ever had any system; he was either viewed as an eclectic, flitting from flower to flower and sipping its honey as his fancy pleased; or else he was thought to be only a queer ancient Jewish preacher and homilist, who fell back on whatever philosophical ideas he had happened to pick up (a *spermologos*, as the Athenians thought St. Paul!) and which happened to suit his turn of mind at the moment. Professor Wolfson takes him much more seriously, and finds that the fragmentary pieces of his system do fit together. He emerges from the labyrinth with a very challenging map of its mazes!

The great question which will be posed is this: Is it true that Philo was really the first major philosopher to combine the two principles of reason and revelation, so that it was his system which dominated almost all later philosophy (all religious philosophy, that is), for seventeen centuries, Christian, Islamic, and Jewish? Was his influence greater than that of Plotinus? Or was Plotinus dependent upon Philo? We do not question the character assigned to "mediaeval" philosophy; but there were others who sought to combine reason and revelation—Stoics and Eclectics, and even Epicureans (Diogenes of Oenoanda, for example, with his "good message of the Book"). It is a pity the works of Posidonius have per-

ished: he was an early example of this type of religious thought. And from Cornutus the Stoic to Maximus the Middle Platonist, men tried to interpret Homer as a revelation of divine truth and to correlate the deliverances of this revelation (interpreted allegorically or otherwise) with the discoveries of unaided human reason. It may be that we shall have to be content simply to rate Philo as one of the most representative, perhaps *the* great representative mind of this era, when philosophy was turning from West to East, from rationality to revelation, or rather from reason alone and unaided to reason plus revelation, or revelation which was to be expounded and interpreted by reason; and since he lived early in this era, and was taken over by Christians in the Alexandrine school, his influence upon the whole of the "mediaeval" period was immense.

This is not to cavil at Professor Wolfson's idealization of Philo the philosopher; for the importance of Philo the philosopher remains to be made out as the successive volumes in the series are written. It may of course turn out that Philo really was the creative thinker —or at least the concrete and synthetic thinker, who drew together the various principles abroad in the thought of his time and shaped them into something of a harmony and so preserved them for posterity (with immense consequences for Christianity and Islam and for mediaeval Judaism). The historians of philosophy have for a long time, since the days of Hegel and even before his time, divided the subject into ancient, mediaeval, and modern. They have duly emphasized the rational element in Greek philosophy, and in Roman (esp. Stoicism); they have recognized the strange, new element in "mediaeval" (including patristic) philosophy, viz. the appeal to revelation; but they have not as a rule recognized the total difference—in this respect —between "mediaeval" and ancient philosophy. Instead of revelation coming in as an extra and superior source of knowledge, in spite of whose presence pure philosophy could maintain itself in isolation—and did so maintain itself in many cases (contrast the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa Theologiae*)— instead of this, the real situation is as follows: "Between ancient Greek philosophy which knew not Scripture and the philosophy which ever since the seventeenth century has tried to free itself from the influence of Scripture there was a philosophy which placed itself at the service of Scripture and was willing to take orders from it" (ii. 439). At last we have an insight which makes the process clear. It is the Bible that makes all the difference. And Philo is not one of the last of the ancients, but the first of the new succession! I would only add that "Christian" or "mediaeval" philosophy is the heir not only of Philo and of Alexandrine biblicism but of the whole Hellenistic age—of course with more attention to certain elements in its inheritance than to others. It was chiefly Platonic metaphysics and Stoic ethics which were treasured and developed by the Church.

It is interesting that Professor Wolfson does not share the view of Ziegert and Goodenough, that a complete mystery religion can be detected just below the surface in Philo. "He uses terms borrowed from the mysteries in the same way as he uses terms borrowed from popular religion and from mythology, all of them because they were part of common speech" (i. 46).—This opening chapter, by the way, on "Hellenistic Judaism and Philo," is extremely important for biblical students, and should not be overlooked.

Professor Wolfson assumes, apparently, that the main contacts between Philo and the N. T. are to be found in the Fourth Gospel. This is contrary to the general tendency and general position of present-day N. T. exegesis. The real contacts are with the Epistle to Hebrews. James Moffatt told me that before he wrote his commentary on Hebrews he read every word of Philo and underlined every term, phrase, idiom, or expression of an idea which had a parallel in the epistle; when he finished he had over 1500 contacts. One wonders how many could be found for the Fourth Gospel—not so many, I suspect.

It goes without saying that every theological library must have this book, and that every serious student of the Bible must make its acquaintance: or, better stated, that he will revel in it, and will find much to aid him in his interpretation of Holy Scripture. It is a pity that there are so many misprints. Let us hope these may be corrected in the next edition.

FREDERICK C. GRANT
Union Theological Seminary

Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII). By E. G. Rupp. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. xvi + 220. $2.75.

All too frequently we present the earlier stages of the English Reformation in terms of the ecclesiastical-political factors—the repercussions of the 'King's matter'—while relegating to the footnotes or treating with scant courtesy the religious factor, without which, some of us believe, the breach with Rome would have slight justification. To be sure, the fermenting ideas of the continental reformers were but faintly reflected in the religious formularies of the Henrician period and hardly at all in the constitutional legislation of the Reformation Parliament. However, neither royal orthodoxy or the North Sea could keep them out of the land. Luther's teachings found an English home in Cambridge colleges and in Wolsey's great foundation at Oxford, in country vicarages and houses of religion, in the counting-rooms of merchants and in episcopal palaces. Thus the train was being laid for the explosion which was to come with swiftness upon Henry's death.

Much has been written with regard to the impact of Calvinism and the Reformed type of Protestantism upon the English Church and religion; little about the Lutheran influences which preceded. It is now more than a half-century since the publication of the *Lutheran Movement in England*, by the competent American Lutheran scholar, H. E. Jacobs. In the essays which make up the volume under consideration, Mr. Rupp, an English Wesleyan and 1940 winner of the Cranmer Prize, returns to this neglected theme. It is his purpose to trace the avenues of infiltration of continental reformation ideas into England and the germination of Lutheran thought in English minds. Latent Lollardy was quickened by winds from across the North Sea, and our attention is called to a group of "Christian Brethren," an association "which embraced men of different callings, different interest, and different theological opinion, yet all joined by a common concern for reformation in doctrine and church life, and that linked the workers for that reform in England with their brethren overseas." Their effective promotion of the study of the Bible and Lutheran books naturally alarmed the ecclesiastical authorities. Men like Tyndale and John Frith seem to have had connections with this group.

Through the "Brethren," through young Cambridge dons who were adherents of the New Learning and of Erasmian biblical scholarship, and through English exiles on the continent, Lutheranism won its way—at great personal peril to its exponents.

Henry's diplomatic dealings with the Lutheran princes of Germany and their theologians are recounted at length—a matter too little regarded by Anglicans, since it was through the medium of these negotiations that the language of the Lutheran Confession entered the English formularies at certain points.

Rupp's eighth chapter, "Justification by Faith and the English Reformers," amply demonstrates the appropriation of this cardinal article of Lutheranism by the English evangelicals—a fact unpalatable to certain myopic schools of Anglicanism who apparently take for native manufacture what is clearly shown (by verbal parallels) to be an importation. In short, Mr. Rupp has the courage to affirm (p. 173):

". . . between the Continental and the English Reformers there was striking and substantial agreement about the teaching of Justification by Faith. We now add as corollary that, whatever marks of compromise may lie upon the Anglican formularies, their teaching is unintelligible apart from the Protestant doctrine and confessions, while they can only be made to teach the definitions of the Council of Trent by being arbitrarily stretched and twisted from their proper setting."

Anyone who will take the trouble to set the English Reformation in its larger context will come to realize that this position (whether one likes it or not) is not easily to be overthrown as a fact of history, whatever its present relevance.

P. V. Norwood
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

The Kingship of Christ. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1948, pp. 158.

These Stone Lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary are an interpretation of what the author regards as the central unifying

Die urchristliche Mission: Voraussetzungen, Motive und Methoden. By Rudolf Liechtenhan. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1946, pp. 98. Fr. 7.80.

Unsatisfied with Harnack's thesis that Jesus himself planned no Gentile-mission and with Bultmann's arguments against the authenticity of Mt. 16:17–19, the author begins with a discussion of that passage. The question, he holds, is not whether Jesus actually used some Aramaic equivalent of "ecclesia," but whether the entity denoted by it, viz. a community of disciples, had a place in his work. While he admits that vs. 19 disagrees with the facts in Mk. 10:38ff, 9:34ff, 38ff, Liechtenhan makes a valiant effort to salvage from this saying to Peter about the church some historical kernel. He believes—and this is perhaps the weakest link in his thesis—that a more original form of the same tradition is preserved in Lk. 22:31. This saying, although it lacks the name of honor, Cephas-Peter, promises that after his recovery from the attack of Satan (cf. the "gates of hades" in Mt.!), Simon will be established as the leader of his brethren for the continuation of his Lord's work. Moreover, the setting of this saying in Luke, as part of the farewell discourse, means that it originated at a time when Jesus was already faced with rejection by his people and with the attendant necessity of providing for the "little flock" which is to inherit the kingdom.

To enlarge that little flock Jesus had sent out the twelve to gather in the "lost sheep" of the house of Israel. But the command, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles," applied only to the immediate activity of the apostles during Jesus' life-time. Even Jesus himself conferred healing upon non-Jews and it is impossible to draw a sharp line between the healings and the proclamation, since both draw men into the sphere of God's sovereignty. Besides, it is not the house of Israel as a whole which is named as the object of the mission, but rather its lost sheep, i.e. those excluded by its official representatives. It is God's will to over-rule the verdict of ecclesiastics with sovereign magnanimity, and this is precisely the work of Jesus. In this connection Liechtenhan lays considerable weight upon the traditions preserved in such sayings as Lk. 4:16–27, 13:28–30, 14:16–24; Mk. 12:1–12, which hint that salvation, rejected by the people to whom it was originally promised, will now be offered to those outside. Indeed, if Jesus viewed his task as that of the Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah—and this is to be maintained according to Liechtenhan—then he must be the "light of the Gentiles" who belong to the "many" for whom he gives his life as a ransom. While the immediate consequence of his rejection by Israel is not the mission to the Gentiles but his death which ratifies the new covenant, that covenant includes not merely the twelve table-companions at the Supper but the "many" to whom they are thus obligated to extend it. And if, in its present redaction, Mt. 28:16–20 is secondary, still the appearances of the risen Christ were appeals for the continuation of his work, as is shown by the testimony of Paul; according to 1 Cor. 9:1, vision and vocation to the mission coincide.

But first the primitive community of disciples had to fulfill its work among its own nation. However, since Israel had joined with the Gentiles against the Servant of the Lord, it had ceased to be a community destined for salvation (*Heilsgemeinde*). Admission to the kingdom, therefore, now results from the decisive acts of individuals: repentance and baptism, which so far as the Jew is concerned means an act of "de-solidarization" from the guilty nation. Consequently Paul was bound to oppose the demand for the circumcision of Gentile converts; why should they desire admission to a people already under divine judgment only to "de-solidarize" themselves from it again by baptism? Paul's opponents might argue that circumcision admits one not merely to the nation but to the old covenant, which only Israel, not God, had broken, a covenant not abolished but rather continued in the new. Yet the events of history were against them, for God himself granted his Spirit to the uncircumcised. Nevertheless, the missionary task was from the first never simply a matter of the conversion of individuals but always included their incorporation into the new *Heilsgemeinde*, the Church. As Liechtenhan well puts it, the question whether one could remain a Christian apart from the Church simply did not exist; modern individualism was unthinkable in the primitive age. Together the members of the body of Christ are charged with responsibility for the mission; together

they accept the task of shining as light in a dark world. The missionary functions of the charismatic endowments (esp. 1 Cor. 12–14) are ably discussed in the concluding pages.

Such in brief is the thesis of this interesting and stimulating study. That the thesis is not without some serious defects in detail does not obscure the numerous constructive contributions of the author, most of which could not even be mentioned in a bare résumé. One regrets that lack of space forbids quoting in full an exalted passage at the end of Ch. 8 (p. 75) which pictures Paul the missionary as one overwhelmed by the irresistible power of an infinitely high and holy Will, yet of an intimate Spirit, the power of a compassionate Love which seeks and realizes fellowship with man in all his need and guilt and becomes in the man who is apprehended by it a never-resting energy and devotion. For one comes away from the New Testament convinced that it is that Spirit which is the secret to any understanding of the success of the primitive Christian mission.

OSCAR J. F. SEITZ

Bexley Hall

Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. By Harry Austryn Wolfson. Two vols. Harvard University Press, 1947, pp. xvi + 462, xiv + 531. $10.00.

In 1934 Professor Wolfson published his work on *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, in which he showed how that philosophy rejected the fundamental principles which had been accepted for the preceding seventeen centuries, viz. a system based on revelation. Since the publication of that study, he has been working back through these seventeen centuries to the stage where the system first emerges. That point he believes to be represented by Philo, for whom revelation and reason were certainly correlative, comparable, and capable of unification. What Professor Wolfson now proposes to do is trace the history of this "mediaeval" system as it stretches from Philo to Spinoza, a system taken for granted by almost all philosophers, Jewish and Moslem as well as Christian—the last chapter in the present work sketches its main outlines. In this proposed series, the present two volumes on Philo are the second book—the first will presumably be a general introductory study of Greek philosophy; later volumes will study post-Philonic philosophers, and the series will conclude with a revised and expanded edition of the book on Spinoza.

The present work is a vast and amply documented survey of Philo's thought. It is not enough, in expounding Philo, simply to select a few great passages (on God, Logos, Eternity of the World, etc.) and explain these; for Philo is a preacher, and never tells all in any one passage; he is fragmentary, and his primary purpose is to expound scripture—the result is that if one wishes to discover the Philonic system underlying this scattered exegesis and these fragmentary homilies, he must take into account a hundred passages, and supply more than one missing link by hypothesis and inference. I think no one has ever penetrated the labyrinthine depths of Philo's philosophy more deeply than Professor Wolfson. Some writers have dismissed the suggestion that Philo ever had any system; he was either viewed as an eclectic, flitting from flower to flower and sipping its honey as his fancy pleased; or else he was thought to be only a queer ancient Jewish preacher and homilist, who fell back on whatever philosophical ideas he had happened to pick up (a *spermologos*, as the Athenians thought St. Paul!) and which happened to suit his turn of mind at the moment. Professor Wolfson takes him much more seriously, and finds that the fragmentary pieces of his system do fit together. He emerges from the labyrinth with a very challenging map of its mazes!

The great question which will be posed is this: Is it true that Philo was really the first major philosopher to combine the two principles of reason and revelation, so that it was his system which dominated almost all later philosophy (all religious philosophy, that is), for seventeen centuries, Christian, Islamic, and Jewish? Was his influence greater than that of Plotinus? Or was Plotinus dependent upon Philo? We do not question the character assigned to "mediaeval" philosophy; but there were others who sought to combine reason and revelation—Stoics and Eclectics, and even Epicureans (Diogenes of Oenoanda, for example, with his "good message of the Book"). It is a pity the works of Posidonius have per-

ished: he was an early example of this type of religious thought. And from Cornutus the Stoic to Maximus the Middle Platonist, men tried to interpret Homer as a revelation of divine truth and to correlate the deliverances of this revelation (interpreted allegorically or otherwise) with the discoveries of unaided human reason. It may be that we shall have to be content simply to rate Philo as one of the most representative, perhaps *the* great representative mind of this era, when philosophy was turning from West to East, from rationality to revelation, or rather from reason alone and unaided to reason plus revelation, or revelation which was to be expounded and interpreted by reason; and since he lived early in this era, and was taken over by Christians in the Alexandrine school, his influence upon the whole of the "mediaeval" period was immense.

This is not to cavil at Professor Wolfson's idealization of Philo the philosopher; for the importance of Philo the philosopher remains to be made out as the successive volumes in the series are written. It may of course turn out that Philo really was the creative thinker —or at least the concrete and synthetic thinker, who drew together the various principles abroad in the thought of his time and shaped them into something of a harmony and so preserved them for posterity (with immense consequences for Christianity and Islam and for mediaeval Judaism). The historians of philosophy have for a long time, since the days of Hegel and even before his time, divided the subject into ancient, mediaeval, and modern. They have duly emphasized the rational element in Greek philosophy, and in Roman (esp. Stoicism); they have recognized the strange, new element in "mediaeval" (including patristic) philosophy, viz. the appeal to revelation; but they have not as a rule recognized the total difference—in this respect —between "mediaeval" and ancient philosophy. Instead of revelation coming in as an extra and superior source of knowledge, in spite of whose presence pure philosophy could maintain itself in isolation—and did so maintain itself in many cases (contrast the *Summa contra Gentiles* and the *Summa Theologiae*)—instead of this, the real situation is as follows: "Between ancient Greek philosophy which knew not Scripture and the philosophy which ever since the seventeenth century has tried to free itself from the influence of Scripture there was a philosophy which placed itself at the service of Scripture and was willing to take orders from it" (ii. 439). At last we have an insight which makes the process clear. It is the Bible that makes all the difference. And Philo is not one of the last of the ancients, but the first of the new succession! I would only add that "Christian" or "mediaeval" philosophy is the heir not only of Philo and of Alexandrine biblicism but of the whole Hellenistic age—of course with more attention to certain elements in its inheritance than to others. It was chiefly Platonic metaphysics and Stoic ethics which were treasured and developed by the Church.

It is interesting that Professor Wolfson does not share the view of Ziegert and Goodenough, that a complete mystery religion can be detected just below the surface in Philo. "He uses terms borrowed from the mysteries in the same way as he uses terms borrowed from popular religion and from mythology, all of them because they were part of common speech" (i. 46).—This opening chapter, by the way, on "Hellenistic Judaism and Philo," is extremely important for biblical students, and should not be overlooked.

Professor Wolfson assumes, apparently, that the main contacts between Philo and the N. T. are to be found in the Fourth Gospel. This is contrary to the general tendency and general position of present-day N. T. exegesis. The real contacts are with the Epistle to Hebrews. James Moffatt told me that before he wrote his commentary on Hebrews he read every word of Philo and underlined every term, phrase, idiom, or expression of an idea which had a parallel in the epistle; when he finished he had over 1500 contacts. One wonders how many could be found for the Fourth Gospel—not so many, I suspect.

It goes without saying that every theological library must have this book, and that every serious student of the Bible must make its acquaintance: or, better stated, that he will revel in it, and will find much to aid him in his interpretation of Holy Scripture. It is a pity that there are so many misprints. Let us hope these may be corrected in the next edition.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Union Theological Seminary

Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII). By E. G. Rupp. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. xvi + 220. $2.75.

All too frequently we present the earlier stages of the English Reformation in terms of the ecclesiastical-political factors—the repercussions of the 'King's matter'—while relegating to the footnotes or treating with scant courtesy the religious factor, without which, some of us believe, the breach with Rome would have slight justification. To be sure, the fermenting ideas of the continental reformers were but faintly reflected in the religious formularies of the Henrician period and hardly at all in the constitutional legislation of the Reformation Parliament. However, neither royal orthodoxy or the North Sea could keep them out of the land. Luther's teachings found an English home in Cambridge colleges and in Wolsey's great foundation at Oxford, in country vicarages and houses of religion, in the counting-rooms of merchants and in episcopal palaces. Thus the train was being laid for the explosion which was to come with swiftness upon Henry's death.

Much has been written with regard to the impact of Calvinism and the Reformed type of Protestantism upon the English Church and religion; little about the Lutheran influences which preceded. It is now more than a half-century since the publication of the *Lutheran Movement in England*, by the competent American Lutheran scholar, H. E. Jacobs. In the essays which make up the volume under consideration, Mr. Rupp, an English Wesleyan and 1940 winner of the Cranmer Prize, returns to this neglected theme. It is his purpose to trace the avenues of infiltration of continental reformation ideas into England and the germination of Lutheran thought in English minds. Latent Lollardy was quickened by winds from across the North Sea, and our attention is called to a group of "Christian Brethren," an association "which embraced men of different callings, different interest, and different theological opinion, yet all joined by a common concern for reformation in doctrine and church life, and that linked the workers for that reform in England with their brethren overseas." Their effective promotion of the study of the Bible and Lutheran books naturally alarmed the ecclesiastical authorities. Men like Tyndale and John Frith seem to have had connections with this group.

Through the "Brethren," through young Cambridge dons who were adherents of the New Learning and of Erasmian biblical scholarship, and through English exiles on the continent, Lutheranism won its way—at great personal peril to its exponents.

Henry's diplomatic dealings with the Lutheran princes of Germany and their theologians are recounted at length—a matter too little regarded by Anglicans, since it was through the medium of these negotiations that the language of the Lutheran Confession entered the English formularies at certain points.

Rupp's eighth chapter, "Justification by Faith and the English Reformers," amply demonstrates the appropriation of this cardinal article of Lutheranism by the English evangelicals—a fact unpalatable to certain myopic schools of Anglicanism who apparently take for native manufacture what is clearly shown (by verbal parallels) to be an importation. In short, Mr. Rupp has the courage to affirm (p. 173):

". . . between the Continental and the English Reformers there was striking and substantial agreement about the teaching of Justification by Faith. We now add as corollary that, whatever marks of compromise may lie upon the Anglican formularies, their teaching is unintelligible apart from the Protestant doctrine and confessions, while they can only be made to teach the definitions of the Council of Trent by being arbitrarily stretched and twisted from their proper setting."

Anyone who will take the trouble to set the English Reformation in its larger context will come to realize that this position (whether one likes it or not) is not easily to be overthrown as a fact of history, whatever its present relevance.

P. V. Norwood
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

The Kingship of Christ. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1948, pp. 158.

These Stone Lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary are an interpretation of what the author regards as the central unifying

message of recent European theology. Beyond the controversy between Barth and Brunner on revelation and the confusing problems presented to Church life by Fascism, Dr. Visser 't Hooft finds common ground in the doctrine of the Kingship of Christ. The themes of Christ as prophet and as priest have received more consideration in Reformation theology than "the Cosmic Christ, who is not only the Lord of the Church but the present though invisible ruler of the universe, to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth, who has triumphed over all powers, under whose feet all things have been put and who will return in glory" (p. 19).

Chapter II contains one of the clearest summaries in English of the struggle of the Church in Germany, Holland, and Norway interpreted in terms of the Kingship of Christ as providing its theological defense and its practical dynamic.

Chapter III interprets the New Testament in terms of Christ as Lord and the Kingdom of God as both a coming event and a present reality. Rejecting both futurist and realized eschatology, the author holds that Christ's victory in his resurrection has dethroned the powers of evil, but history continues to be demonic because the dethroned powers will not admit their defeat until the End. He sides with Theo Preyss:

"There runs through the writings of the New Testament a sort of objective dialectic which results from the paradoxical situation of this intermediary time, this parenthesis in which the Church realizes that it lives between the old world, defeated but still terribly aggressive, and the world to come, already present in the resurrection of Jesus but still veiled and hidden to the eyes of man" (p. 82).

Chapter IV describes Christ as King in the Church. A high doctrine of the Church is outlined on the concept of the King-Messiah fashioning to Himself the New Israel of God, but the author warns against any too simple identification of the Church with the Kingdom of God. A living Church is a confessing rather than a confessionalist Church. The imperative to union is the common Head of the shattered parts of the Body of Christ.

The last chapter carries the basic pattern of Christ as King beyond the Church where He is confessed as Lord to the world which has not accepted his claims. Both Church and world belong to Christ as the center of all history, but they differ in that

"the Church shares in the victory. It is the realm in which the new creation is already taking place. . . . The present world does not belong to that age. It also will be renewed but that will be at the end of time. It is already in 'crisis,' that is, under judgment, but it does not realize its perilous condition" (p. 124).

Dr. Visser 't Hooft believes in the Christocentric conception of the state as cutting across the Thomist doctrine of natural law, the Lutheran doctrine of the two realms, and the Calvinist doctrine of common grace. He states that it provides a sure basis for a social gospel and makes the Bible relevant for social ethics.

This short book is a masterpiece of analysis and sympathetic interpretation. It should be of very real help in furthering understanding between the Anglo-Saxon and Continental wings of the ecumenical movement. The suggestions of the relevance of the Lordship of Christ for Christian ethics should have been given greater interpretation and development.

WILLIAM J. WOLF
Episcopal Theological School

Seeds of Redemption. By Bernard Eugene Meland. New York: Macmillan, 1947, pp. ix + 162. $2.50.

The sub-title of Father L. S. Thornton's book, *The Incarnate Lord,* is: "An Essay concerning the Doctrine of the Incarnation in its Relation to Organic Conceptions." I do not think it would be unfair to suggest as a sub-title for Professor Meland's book: "An Essay concerning the Christian Doctrine of God in its Relation to Organic Conceptions." In this book, as well as in a recent article in the *Journal of Religion,* he has revealed his own deep admiration for and affinity with Whitehead's Philosophy of Organism, and this makes his thought of particular importance in considering the relations between philosophy and theology at the present time. I doubt if there is any book which gives a clearer and more concise exposition of the Doctrine of God in terms of organic categories.

The general viewpoint from which the book is written is described at the very outset.

"The energies of new growth are pushing beneath the soil of *a world become a desert.*

They are, as it were, seeds of redemption; for what now works on hiddenly within them might, should they come to fruition, reclaim this generation from destruction. Whether or not there will be time for the gentle might of their working to gather as a reconstructive force to break through old structures and renew opportunity and incentive among our people to live in response to the creative working of God, no man can say. . . . Yet so long as human beings exist and there is flexibility among them as well as incentive to alter prevailing tendencies which have made for deterioration of spiritual sensibilities, the prospects for redemption are present. It is on this assumption that I have written this book."

Such terms as energy, growth, gentle, creative working, sensibilities, recur again and again in the book and define its outlook: God is the creative workman, man is called to respond sensitively to the creative process, all society takes on a creative character, all enterprises within society are intended to become agencies of human fulfillment to the glory of God.

After two chapters of diagnosis, Meland sets to work to sketch what he calls "a deeper view of life." It does not involve an abandonment of scientific method or exact thought, but "includes sensitivities of imagination, of wonder, of insight which enable us to become aware of the gentle workings of the creative God." For God is "an immensely sensitive nature within nature, brooding over the waters, giving light to its darkness." God is ever related to what is called a "torrent of creativity": he is ever working upon it "with the dexterous hands of a creative artist." The result of this working is the creation of "Spirit" and in this process of creation man can take a part. Failure to do so through insensitivity, through disproportionate emphases, through mediocrity, is sin. Sin can only be overcome, man can only be redeemed from it, by suffering, and it is within such a pattern of creative suffering as is portrayed by the figure of the Servant of the Lord that we see the true significance of Jesus. In two final chapters the insights of the book are applied in an exceedingly suggestive way to the problems of our own age.

My general reaction to the book is one of high appreciation and real gratitude for the presentation of a particular viewpoint. Christianity today cannot afford to remain indifferent to the new insights of modern science, to such a magnificent philosophical reconstruction as Whitehead has given, to the widespread emphasis upon organic categories which is to be found in various realms of human thinking at the present time. Yet I cannot avoid the further reaction that this is a very one-sided treatment of the Christian faith. The biblical prophetic tradition, the doctrine of the Word of God, the significance of the critical encounter, the implications of Justification by Faith, the meaning of the Covenant-society—all these seem scarcely to enter into the author's purview. Yet that they belong to the very essence of the biblical view of life it would be hard to deny. That there is much of value and of rich suggestiveness in Professor Meland's treatment I am convinced; but I do not see how his thought can become truly influential until it is related far more closely to the dominant ideas and categories of the Hebrew-Christian tradition.

F. W. DILLISTONE
Episcopal Theological School

The Elements of Moral Theology. By R. C. Mortimer. London: Adam and Charles Black (New York, The Macmillan Co.), pp. vi + 236. $3.50.

The Canon Law of the Episcopal Church requires of Candidates for the Ministry a knowledge of Moral Theology. This has not been easy to supply since text books in that subject by Anglicans, while not without merit, do not in fact cover the field. Accordingly, recourse has been had to manuals by Roman Catholics available in English. There are a considerable number of our priests who have worked somewhat painfully through the two volumes of Thomas Slater, with occasional reference to Joseph Rickaby. Our guides, naturally, pointed out the necessity for wide divergence in many places from the line taken in the handbooks. This is by no means, however, to repudiate the value of the work as a whole. Emil Brunner points out the superiority of Roman Catholic guidance in concrete matters over Protestant books, and it was as steps toward providing a remedy that he wrote *The Divine Imperative* and *Justice and the Social Order.* Now, however, at long last a priest of the Church of England has brought some relief to "Theological Colleges," in shape of what he modestly calls an *elementary* treatise.

Canon Mortimer has selected the core of the Roman manuals—the very sections most used by Anglicans—and put them in good, clear, concise, readable English. "Live" people and "living" problems replace the Tituses, Balbuses, and Caias of the stereotyped illustrations. The whole is arranged in superbly logical order. Marshall Bowyer Stewart said twenty years ago that Kenneth E. Kirk after all his books on the subject was still writing *about* Moral Theology. It must be said now in contradistinction that Mortimer *writes Moral Theology itself*. We have a book that will be useful for years to come.

After this expression of deep appreciation it may appear most ungracious to launch into radical criticism, but it has to be done—for the good of the cause. Canon Mortimer sees quite correctly that the great point of divergence between ourselves and Rome lies in the treatment of law. Indeed the impression left by studying the Latin books is that they have barely escaped a legalism as rigid as first century Judaism. Bishop Kirk promised some relief from this by the extended use of (technical) custom in place of formal law. We had a right to expect from our Oxford Canon a further development of this line, for he acknowledges his debt to his Bishop. Beyond citations from Hooker in place of Suarez or DeLugo, however, it is difficult to perceive any difference from the Roman books.

It is not as though there were no help available to deal with this most crucial point. Wilbur M. Urban in his *Fundamentals of Ethics* uses the work of the American jurists Roscoe Pound and Benjamin Cardozo in recognizing the dependence of law on value. Had this been perceived it would have called for a more extended treatment of the "End of Man"—the goods or good which law is to conserve or realize. It is at the starting point that the mistakes are made.

Moral theologians say they take the conclusions of Dogmatic Theology for granted. They take part of them and leave crucial elements out of consideration. The Dominicans McHugh and Callan do indeed in two or three sentences recognize the communion of saints as a *secondary* element in the Final (Eschatological) State but they never refer to it again or make use of it in a practical way. Canon Mortimer doesn't even mention it. The whole social character of the Christian life is left without any firm ground.

The second major error lies in developing a Moral Theology *by itself*. Bishop Kirk in his first book saw clearly that if Moral Treatises in the Christian Church are ever to get in a healthy state we must go back before the day when the subject was split into several fields. He proposed to deal with Ascetical and Moral Theology together. The division, however, is really fourfold; Moral Philosophy, Mystical Theology, Ascetical Theology, and Moral Theology. They were not so separated in the *Summa* of St. Thomas—from which they took their origin. It is more difficult to handle that way, but difficult or not it is the only way that we can escape the pitfall of legalism.

One notes, however, with gratitude that Canon Mortimer has followed the Dominican rather than the Jesuit order in the arrangement of his book—which is again a return to St. Thomas. The three theological virtues and the four cardinal virtues furnish a structure which dispenses with a separate treatment of the Ten Commandments—one more step toward freedom from legalism—and one step nearer to articulation with Ascetic and Mystical Theology.

HOWARD HENRY HASSINGER
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Christian Apologetics. By Alan Richardson. Harper, 1947, pp. 256. $3.00.

A summary review cannot do justice to this essay in constructive theology. Nothing comparable to it has appeared in our generation nor for many years. The concern of the author is with "Apologetics, as distinct from apology," and he regards his subject as "the study of the ways and means of defending Christian truth."

"It is not the task of apologetics, as a theological discipline, to meet a particular attack on Christianity or to add one more volume to the library of Christian apologies. Apologetics deal with the relationship of the Christian faith to the wider sphere of man's 'secular' knowledge—philosophy, science, history, sociology, and so on—with a view to showing that faith is not at variance with the truth that these enquiries have uncovered. . . . Thus apologetics as a theological discipline is a kind of intellectual stock-taking on the part of Christian thinkers, who may be described as attempting to reckon up their assets in the light of con-

temporary philosophical thought and scientific knowledge. . . . Hence, also, apologetics is primarily a study undertaken by Christians for Christians; and in this respect it is to be distinguished from the task of apology, since an apology is addressed to non-Christians. Apologetics is thus a necessary preparation for the work of an apologist, or more simply, it is a part of the essential training of Christian preachers, evangelists, and teachers" or, as it is put in a footnote (p. 20), "apologetics is related to apology as, let us say, homiletics is related to preaching."

The principal question, as Mr. Richardson sees it, "with which the Christian apologist today must come to grips, if he is to make vital contact with the mind of his age, lies in the sphere of scientific methodology rather in that of metaphysics and epistemology as such. . . ." He goes on to point out that "theological science, like all the sciences, derives its distinctive quality as a rational attempt to understand a part of our total human experience from its employment of scientific method —in its case, the method distinctively appropriate to theological investigation."

In setting forth such a methodology, the author handles with brilliant competence the problem of the relation of faith, reason, and revelation. The development of the book's theme is something not to be merely read, but to be mastered. In order, there are chapters on theology as an empirical science, Christianity and ideology, theology and history.

Next are considered general revelation, special revelation, miracles, prophecy, the inspiration and authority of the Bible. In conclusion there is a splendid chapter on "Faith and Reason."

Although the author is not committed to an "existentialist philosophy" he recognizes its valid insights, as well as those of Freud and Marx, into the existential character of human knowledge, and he shows clearly how this "faith-principle" is basic to all the sciences including theology (pp. 77, 94ff, 230).

Perhaps the reviewer can raise one question without seeming to be captious or lacking in appreciation for Alan Richardson's notable contribution. The apologetic of the author is explicitly directed to our age, therefore his primary concern is the establishment of a theological methodology, which is to say the epistemological problem, philosophically speaking. This is still the main preoccupation of "philosophy" today as it has been for the three hundred years since Descartes. Occasional protests have been voiced, but the principal stream of philosophical thought has continued to evade, or at least not get to, the metaphysical problem.

I think that the tide is turning in philosophy. More and more it is being brought to the fore that our opinion as to the character, form, and validity of human knowledge is dependent on, or mutually inter-dependent with, our conception of reality. The metaphysical question cannot be downed. William Temple saw this clearly and tried to meet the "problem of reality" head on. Alan Richardson indicates more than once that he is aware of the problem but for the most part "passes by on the other side."

A great tradition as well as one of the able theological minds of our day produced this book. The author states in his preface, "There is one figure, amongst the great names of the past, whose thinking upon the question of the nature of Christian truth has a peculiar relevance for the circumstances of our day, which in many respects are so akin to those of his; and to him the writer's indebtedness will appear throughout this book." The reader will find permeating every page not only the thought but the feeling of St. Augustine.

ALDEN DREW KELLEY
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

The Religion of Philosophers. By James H. Dunham. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1947, pp. 314. $4.00.

It is no easy task to distill the "religion" of any writer from his philosophical writings. The author of the book under review has attempted this and, one may note, with a good measure of success. At all points throughout the book, three restrictions are imposed and rigidly observed by the author. "Religion is not defined except as the thinker defines it for himself" (p. 1), and "we shall at the end of the study of each type [of religious thought] refuse to place its author under some established rubric" (p. 3). Furthermore, these studies have been "confined . . . to the didactic issues at stake, leaving personal sentiments to take their place in an organized biography of the philosopher" (p. 2).

One may have legitimate differences regarding the validity of these restrictions, particularly the last enumerated above. We may well ask if the isolation of "didactic issues" from "personal sentiments" leaves us with a true picture of the total thought of any person regarding his religion. It would seem to this reviewer that this kind of arbitrary and artificial abstraction hardly does justice to the religious thought of a philosopher such as St. Augustine (who is one of the ten discussed) whose thought and life are so inextricably bound together that any exposition of the "didactic issues" without consideration of "personal sentiments" cannot but result in distortion. One may raise serious questions as to whether religion legitimately may be permitted to stand and be interpreted "apart from its concrete embodiment."

The thought of ten philosophers is discussed from this point of view. A wide variety of writers, representing different ages and types of religious experience and thought, are discussed. The ten thinkers, all of them of the western world, are Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, Marcus Aurelius, Augustine, Leibniz, Spinoza, Hume, Kant, and Comte. The writings of all these men are subjected to analysis according to the principles first set down by Dean Dunham.

Each philosopher is treated separately. No attempt is made to relate or compare them. No label of any kind is attached to them. Each author is allowed to stand on his own and is critically discussed. As a consequence (and this is what the author of the book undoubtedly intends), the book is really a series of critical essays. There is no continuity to the book except for the basic theme of the "religion of philosophers."

With this theme, particularly as reflected in the title of the book, one may take issue. The implication from the title would be that there is one common "religion" shared by the philosophers who appear in the book. Nothing would be farther from the truth. The only unity which may be observed is thematic, viz. that of religious thought. But even this is not accurate. The book is primarily an attempt to reveal the "religious metaphysics" of these philosophers and, indeed, the title of the book might better have indicated that. The "religions" of the philosophers turn out to be many and varied.

All of the chapters, each devoted to a separate philosopher, are about on a par both as to quality and length. If any treatments are to be singled out, those dealing with Marcus Aurelius and Auguste Comte may be cited for clarity and perspicuity. The "religious" thinking of both is set forth in a way which makes them readily understandable. The criticisms are much to the point, although one may disagree with the author's conception of the ontological argument which he believes Comte assumes.

In the chapter dealing with St. Augustine, beside the criticism made earlier, it might have been more helpful had the doctrine of illumination been discussed a little more thoroughly. It is a crucial element in Augustine's epistemology and deserves more explication than is given.

Recognizing the need to be selective in one's choice of philosophers in a book of this nature, one is tempted, nevertheless, to ask why such men as St. Thomas and some rationalistic mystic in the Neo-Platonic strain (such as Plotinus, the Pseudo-Dionysius, or John Scotus Eriugena) might not have been included for discussion. If the selection of philosophers was based, as it would appear, on an attempt to make it representative of various points of view, then the book might well have been expanded to take in a philosopher such as Plotinus or Eriugena.

It is always disturbing to note in an otherwise good piece of printing, such as this is, a number of typographical errors. Misprints such as "precept" for "percept" (p. 12) are particularly confusing. It is also distracting for modern minds to note such archaisms as "conceit" for "concept," though the latter word is frequently used.

There is a detailed index which is of referential assistance, as well as a good working bibliography, although the section on Plato makes a grave omission by not listing any of Plato's Dialogues. Such books as Woodbridge's *Son of Apollo*, A. E. Taylor's *Epicurus*, Gilbert Murray's *The Stoic Philosophy*, John Burnaby's *Amor Dei, A Monument to St. Augustine* edited by M. C. D'Arcy, McKeon's *Philosophy of Spinoza*, and A. D. Lindsay's *Immanuel Kant* among many others might also have deserved inclusion.

SHUNJI F. NISHI

The General Theological Seminary

God Confronts Man in History. By Henry Sloane Coffin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947, pp. 151. $2.50.

Henry Sloane Coffin has become one of the few great and recognized elder statesmen of world Christianity. The former pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York, the recently retired President of the Union Theological Seminary, and one-time moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., for many years has stood for a wise, liberal, gentle yet utterly firm Christian faith which has been the inspiration of multitudes.

When Episcopalians are asked to concentrate on the task of evangelism during the current year, it is fortunate that a book like this, written from such a rich background of experience and knowledge, should be available. For even with its somewhat unfortunate title (unfortunate only from a public relations standpoint) Dr. Coffin's little book expresses the evangelistic spirit of modern Christianity at its best. This book ought to be placed in the hands of key laymen as an inspiration to them and as an orientation toward the spiritual meaning of church membership.

The volume itself is composed of a topical introduction describing Dr. Coffin's activities and impressions as he toured the Far East as lecturer on the Joseph Cook Foundation while the smoke of war was still in the air, and five chapters which are the lectures he gave in the Philippines, China, Siam and India. Lectures—these are really among the finest, wisest, gentlest, most powerful evangelistic sermons that this reviewer has ever read. The faith of the writer comes out through the words and sentences. Here is a Christian interpretation of life made relevant to the modern world.

For many modern religious thinkers a title such as "God Confronts Man in History" would presuppose an analysis of history from within, which reveals the depth of historical problems. Dr. Coffin's book does not so much analyze history as state a Christian judgment about facts which are assumed to be appreciated already. In his introductory chapter, he does comment on the significance of some recent developments—such as the Kuomintang-Communist conflict in China, the Tydings Act in the Philippines, and the partition of Palestine, but while he gives his own opinion he does not explore these for fundamental significance. Instead this book is a statement of the Christian faith as the background against which its readers can do their own historical analysis—both as regards their own lives and as regards the larger movements of men and nations.

The theme of the book is that God is Lord of history, acting most distinctively through the living contact of Jesus Christ with living men and women, as individuals, as groups, as churches, in this modern world. The entire book rings the changes on this theme. Each point is made with simple clarity, and enlarged with a wealth of illustrations. If the book were valuable for nothing else, it would be a gold-mine for its clarity of exposition of the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

Dr. Coffin is not out to let people down easily. He is out to bring them to their knees before their God. In the service of this objective, he admits the failings of western civilization and of the organized churches with utter frankness, yet he insists with complete charity that the Church of Jesus Christ is the redemptive power of God for the world. Into this Church, to the extent that it is humble in its corporate life about its relationships to its God and to historical circumstance, may come the traditions of the nations, each to find its completion and fulfillment in the living Christ.

"One may view the Christian Church in her actual condition as a fellowship of very imperfect and inadequate persons, divided into sometimes rival sects by issues often outworn and trivial, blundering in her methods, negligent of her obligations, and often sinning against God in her faults and follies. Or one may view her in the light of God's intentions for her, with a unique and momentous responsibility to bring His life to an entire world, to harmonize its peoples under Christ, and dowered for this task with incalculable spiritual resources. . . . But despite her unworthiness, her frailties, her scandalous divisions, God works through the Church His redemption of individuals and society. To be sure, His activity is not confined to the Church, but the Church is His chief agent for the achievement of His purpose of reconciling mankind to Himself and imparting His life to men."

The foregoing is a sample of the way Dr. Coffin speaks. Perhaps the content is not new —neither is the Christian Gospel new in an

ordinary historical sense. But the statement is fresh and clear and powerful. One might wish that it made a little more direct contact with the way men understand their need in a world where Christian statements seemed unrelated to living problems, but even so its utter sincerity will win recognition and its clarity will open doors.

This reviewer hopes that those who undertake evangelism in the Episcopal Church this year will use this book as a powerful resource in their work.

CHARLES D. KEAN

Kirkwood, Missouri

A Man Can Live. By Bernard Iddings Bell. Harper, pp. 127. $1.50.

Stop Looking and Listen. By Chad Walsh. Harper, pp. 112. $1.25.

These two books are welcome additions to the growing number of books in "popular" apologetics; useful for the educated layman, the college student, and perhaps even the not too well informed college teacher.

Dr. Bell's book is not so much a sequel to his previous *God Is Not Dead* as a supplement to it. This is not a book of sermons but a developed argument coming out of one or more series of mission addresses, I should guess. Its cumulative impact is great for Dr. Bell writes here with his usual sympathetic courtesy, realism, and emphatic style.

Beginning with man as he is found with all his hungers, the author goes on to show by way of contrast the destiny of man. The possibility of life making sense and of man being able to fulfil his true destiny in these terrible times is set forth with commendable simplicity.

Perhaps one or two glaring defects (minor points) should be noted in passing although they are not involved in the main argument. First is the use of Matthew 28:19–20 as if this represented the ipsissima verba of Jesus; a quite unwarranted assumption, I should think. Second, on p. 51, "It is therefore impossible for a human being to think except in *metaphor* about a being more complex than he is himself. . . . " (Italics are the reviewer's.) Technically the method of thinking involved is *analogical* rather than *metaphorical.* Cf. Przwara's *Polarity* and Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica.* And finally, on p. 83, *"If in any truly Christian sense one is to become moral, one must strive to satisfy the saints."* (Italics are the author's.) Granted the main line of argument in this chapter and elsewhere, certainly it would be sounder to say, "God and His saints." But of deeper significance is the apparent emphasis on morality as striving to satisfy. Isn't this putting morality under the Law and making it a matter exclusively of good works?

Dr. Bell is frequently thought of as a "pessimist." This he denies. The reviewer has thought he was a Christian realist. But the author describes himself as an optimist.

"The pessimist is no fool; he admits the reality of facts, including disconcerting facts. But he cannot see, behind and beyond and beneath the facts, any integrating necessity and plan; all he can see is facts, and they make him mighty unhappy. The optimist is as fearless as any pessimist can be in facing every situation realistically; he too denies no fact, however unpalatable, upsetting, alarming. But he knows also what the pessimist does not know; he knows that which is behind and beyond and beneath the facts."

The final chapter of the book, titled "The Victory," is a moving confession of faith by a truly observing and penetrating thinker.

In contrast to the predominantly sombre hues of Dr. Bell's "still-life" canvas, we have by Dr. Walsh a modern sky-rocket; soaring high amidst a coruscating display of pink and red and green and blue and then breaking into an intense white light which piteously reveals the "sadness of our times."

It is a delightful and fascinating book to read, and it cuts deeply. *Stop Looking and Listen,* from the title to its concluding paragraph, is fresh, arresting, full of "quotable quotes" and high order popular apologetic. No comment will be made on technical and theological details, as the author lays no claim in that direction but states that "anyone who wants a more detailed and profound discussion of Christianity must turn to books by veteran Christians."

The author acknowledges the influence of the writings of C. S. Lewis, B. I. Bell, G. K. Chesterton, and Reinhold Niebuhr. However his own approach and style seem to be more in the tradition of Chesterton than the others. In speaking of "lone-wolf Christians" he says,

"The man who goes to a hillside to watch the sunset and think about God very soon begins to go to the hillside to watch the sunset and think about himself watching the sunset."

In another context the author writes,

"The greatest psychological problem faced by a Christian today is probably a feeling of excessive respectability. This is particularly so in the case of the convert. Once upon a time he was a daring fellow. He shocked the *bourgeoisie* with his brilliant epigrams, and had the reputation of being quite a bohemian and advanced thinker. Now the sweet old ladies who used to shake their heads over him are all smiles as he enters the pew. If only he had decided on Buddhism or Shinto—then he could be religious and stand out from the herd at the same time."

For those who are looking for a book to give to a son, daughter, nephew, or niece in college, this is it. Before giving it away, read it yourself because it manages to convey something of the humor, the simplicity, and the insight of the saints.

ALDEN DREW KELLEY
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Postlude to Skepticism. By Ralph S. Meadowcroft. Louisville, Ky.: Cloister Press, 1947, pp. 238. $2.50.

The Rector of Grace Church, Charleston, S. C., whose radio broadcasts have been among the best heard during the past few years in "religious hour on the air" programmes, has written his first book—and it is a good one. Mr. Meadowcroft reveals himself to be a discerning critic of the times and a forth-right preacher of the gospel; it is gratifying to know that such an understanding yet critical appraisal of our contemporary cultural crisis comes from the pen of a priest of the Episcopal Church.

The theme of the book is that the skepticism which was widespread in the period between the wars has completely broken down; hence there is both opportunity and demand for a faith which comes from beyond the limits of humanity and brings to men the realization that their life has meaning and that it can be empowered by a super-human grace which "will include the totality of human aspirations and activities within the sphere of its influence."

Mr. Meadowcroft has divided his book into three parts. The first is an historical sketch, in which he seeks to show the origin of the skepticism of the twenties and thirties; he distinguishes between the necessary "doubt" of, say, Socrates, which as he rightly sees is indispensable for any sound thinking, and the sheer nihilistic skepticism of those who began with belief only in man and were forced by circumstances to recognize that man himself is no object of trust but a very shaky reed. In the second section, the author argues that the "decline of this attitude" has opened up a new opportunity for a religious faith, since we see now a world which is confused, frustrated, and desperately seeking a faith in something bigger than man. The concluding chapters present Christianity in its relevance to "the mind of today," with special attention to such problems as the relation of God's will and our human existence, the personality of God, the nature of the spiritual life, the significance of the Church, and the social disorders of our age. On each of these, Mr. Meadowcroft has something suggestive and useful to say—even if his style is now and again a bit crabbed and difficult.

We hope that many will read this essay in popular apologetic. There are several slight typographical errors; and surely, on p. 214, "Civitate Dei" ought to be "Civitas Dei."

W. NORMAN PITTENGER
General Theological Seminary

The Future of the American Jew. By Mordecai M. Kaplan. New York: Macmillan, 1948, pp. 571. $6.00.

A full-sized and intrepid study of contemporary Jewish faith and religion has come from Professor Mordecai M. Kaplan, author of *Judaism as Civilization, The Meaning of God in Jewish Experience* and other books. Years in the active pulpit and in the classroom (where he taught theological students, social service graduates, teachers) helped in its preparation and thinking. Every aspect of Jewish religious life in America has been assayed.

Actually, this monumental survey of religious life in America cannot be confined to Jews and to Judaism. Though the author restricted his attention to the Jewish group, his investigations apply with equal cogency to the Chris-

tian church and faith. Only slight changes in nomenclature are necessary to show the Christian parallels. Statistics of church membership are, on the whole, unreliable for Jews and other church-groups; for Zionism, the Christian counterpart is benevolences and missions; the divisions within the Jewish group are no less than the sects and denominations among Christians; Christendom and Judaism face the same disruptive influences of science and nationalism and force. The central concepts and principles of Jewish and Christian faith are under reconsideration and reinterpretation. These include revelation, salvation, chosen people, church and state, God.

The value and importance of Kaplan's book is precisely its comprehension and portrayal of the religious life in America. Its most important chapter is "Basic Values in Jewish Religion" (reiterated in "The Aim of American-Jewish Education" and in "A New Educational Approach to the Bible"). These are equally valid for Christian thought.

The difficult task that Professor Kaplan set himself, and the real accomplishments of his vigorous thought, are manifest by its major contradictions. Kaplan rejects all the traditional teachings on revelation, but in passage after passage adopts "the modern outlook" and "the modern perspective" as though that were the final, ultimate, infallible revelation. Kaplan rejects completely "the concept of the chosen people" and just as often insists absolutely upon "the peoplehood of believers in Israel." He pleads, in many passages, that worship and religion must be "acceptable" (which is a most specious test for truth), and though frequent in his praise of "the modern mind" Kaplan is compelled to add later that "the promises of science and reason and nationalism and democracy have not worked as well as expected." Often, he would re-interpret religious teachings; but never does he seem to remember that "modern concepts" of science and education and politics also require re-interpretation.

Kaplan rejects the Shulkan Aruch code of religious practices, and advises the urgent need for a modern code of religious ethics. Kaplan denies that "belief in immortality of the soul motivates behavior" (p. 205), and teaches salvation as that which makes the future. He makes many seemingly plausible, but untrue, generalizations. "Pre-modern religion reflected a pessimistic and disparaging view of human nature" (p. 190). Or, "intelligence is slowly but surely gaining the upper hand" (p. 237). These statements lack proof. Nor can he resolve difficult questions, which reappear in many forms, as the choice between the particular and the universal ideals; as between freedom over against security and authority, as between a personal God and God as a process.

The contradictions and pitfalls in his reasoning indicate the resolute and ambitious aims of his book, and its value.

RABBI DAVID B. ALPERT

Boston, Massachusetts

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Deuteronomium-Studien. By Gerhard von Rad. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1947, pp. 64.

This little volume is a suggestive instance of the application of form-critical techniques to the Old Testament. From a study of the various literary units now woven into our Book of Deuteronomy, Professor von Rad comes to the conclusion that they stem from two sources: one, the homiletic exposition of ancient laws, which was a regular function of the priest-levites; and the other, the old regulations, going back to the time of the Judges, which governed the conduct of the Holy War. Upon this quite plausible foundation, the author erects a less credible structure of theory with regard to the date and origin of the book. Following Junge, he believes that the old royal and secular army of Israel was destroyed as a result of the exactions of the Assyrians in 701 B.C., and that this necessitated the revival of the ancient national militia which had fought Israel's battles in the days before the monarchy. This had the effect of bringing into positions of influence the conservative country clergy and gentry who were chiefly instrumental in bringing about the Reform of

Josiah. The book concludes with an interesting chapter on the "theology of history" of the Deuteronomic historians.

R. C. D.

Die Auffassung von der Person Jesu im Urchristentum nach den neuesten Forschungen. By Marie Veit. Marburg-Lahn: Druckerei Hermann Bauer, 1946, pp. vii + 115.

This is an inaugural dissertation presented at Marburg by one of Professor Bultmann's graduate students. It is a summary and criticism of the views of Ernst Lohmeyer, Julius Schniewind, Rudolf Otto, Walter Grundmann and Rudolf Meyer. In the end, the author concludes that none of the views represented is satisfactory, and we must take the gospels as they stand. This does not, apparently, mean fundamentalism, but only that the gospels must not be compelled to support some modern theory or other.

It would be well if we had something like this book in English, especially since it applies more incisive criticism to the views discussed (e.g. those of Rudolf Otto) than they have received in English speaking countries.

F. C. G.

The Contemplative Life. By Julianus Pomerius. Translated and annotated by Mary Josephine Suelzer, Ph.D. The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Md., pp. 220. $2.50.

The fourth in the series of translations of the Fathers is a work long ascribed to Prosper of Aquitane, but in these latter days proved to be from the pen of one Julianus Pomerius. Julianus was a teacher of rhetoric who removed from his native Mauretania to Arles and became the instructor of the great Caesarius. He aided the Bishop in saving the literary works of Augustine. The one date that can be fixed for him is A.D. 497, and it is about that time that, at episcopal request, he brought forth his little book. An ancient manuscript has this conclusion (not of course from his pen): "Here end three books—treating concisely, in elegant style, subjects that are useful and necessary for everyone—on the contemplative life, that is, and on the active life and on the virtues and vices." The historian of Christian Ethics will be grateful for evidence that as late as the beginning of the sixth century moralists were regarding the Capital Vices, popularly but falsely called Deadly Sins, as four not seven in number! One gathers from Sister Mary's introduction—an excellent one—that this is the first time that *De vita contemplativa* has appeared in English. It is a finished piece of work.

H. H. H.

Love and Being. An Investigation into the Metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Bernard James Diggs. New York: Vanni, 1947, pp. 180.

He who is not a professional theologian is very apt to think of love as an emotional reaction of some kind and to exhaust its definition with sentimental terms. To him love is a feeling. Unfortunately, there are many who have been at least introduced to the study of theology and who have not got much further than this; they resent the definition of our article that God is "without parts or passions." That is, God is without emotions, and God is love.

This little volume is a factual study of love and being, that is, as the subtitle of the book indicates, "An Investigation into the Metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas."

From the outset we understand that there are different kinds of loves and there may not be any single quality to be called love except in so far as this word includes the three different loves:

(1) The love shared by all living things and directed to objects which afford health, growth, and well-being.
(2) The love characteristic of animals and which is directed to pleasure.
(3) The love peculiar to rational beings which is a love of perceptible things; and we must remember that man "can perceive with his mind as well as his eyes" (p. 14).

In all created beings love is described as an inclination to the good. This moves to desire when the good is absent and to delight when the good is present. Dr. Diggs uses the word *gravity* as a general word describing love and expressing "an attraction of one thing to another such that it moves and is impelled to that other" (p. 31).

The text is well annotated by references to St. Thomas and his commentators. These are all left in Latin. Only one who can read

Latin, therefore, can check the quotations and really understand the meaning of the book. To one trained in metaphysics and in Latin, this book will make a delightful contribution.

R. K. Y.

Christian Ethics and Social Policy. By John C. Bennett. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946, pp. 132. $2.00.

In five admirable Richards Lectures, Dr. Bennett has written a lucid outline of the correlation between Christian ethics and social policy. The lecture on "Four Christian Social Strategies" is the best recent analysis of the major contemporary ways of bringing Christian ethics to bear on the problems of our society—the Catholic way of applied moral law (law of nature), the sectarian solution of withdrawal from participating plus sectarian community, the identification with a particular program (e.g. pacifism), and the double standard for personal and social ethics (the traditional Lutheran solution). "A Fifth Strategy" is then set forth, for which the authority of Temple, Niebuhr and Brunner is claimed, despite their considerable differences—the social relevance and yet the transcendence of the Christian ethic, and the limitations set (a) by human sin to the dominance of Christian principles, and (b) by the relative autonomy of social institutions. The last lecture deals with the social role of the Church.

N. B. N.

A Marriage Manual, for the Administration of the Marriage Canons in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. By the Rt. Rev. James P. DeWolfe. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1947, pp. x + 110. $1.25.

Two carefully selected committees of experts aided Bishop DeWolfe in providing the material for this handbook for clergy. It includes a commentary on the Canons, premarital instruction, a brief treatise on the Church and the Family. A very thorough piece of work for which any parish priest may be grateful.

H. H. H.

Books of Faith and Power. By John T. McNeill. New York: Harpers, 1947, pp. vii + 183. $2.00.

This delightful and happily-titled little book grew out of a series of lectures on "Protestant Classics" given at the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, under the auspices of the Institute for Religious Studies. The six famous books chosen for interpretation, with Dr. McNeill's mature judgment and deep insights, are: Luther's *Christian Liberty,* Calvin's *Institutes,* Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity,* Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* Law's *Serious Call,* and Wesley's *Journal.* Truly a diverse and catholic selection. It is to be hoped that this volume will send many of its readers back to the great originals; to others it will prove a stimulating refresher on masterpieces which in their several ways and in their several spheres have profoundly moved the Christian mind and heart. One would look in vain for a better introduction to these "classics."

P. V. N.

A History of the Jews: From the Babylonian Exile to the end of World War II. By Solomon Grayzel. Philadelphia; Jewish Publication Society, 1947, pp. 835. $3.50.

This is a valuable and well-executed single-volume history of the Jews, obviously a useful reference work and at the same time an eminently readable book. It includes much biographical material, and emphasizes the social aspects of Jewish life and Jewish contributions to culture. The volume includes 121 fine illustrations, two dozen maps, and an extensive bibliography.

H. G.

A Handbook of Judaism: as professed and practiced through the ages. By Meyer Waxman. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1947, pp. xii + 195. $3.50.

The author of this work has attempted to provide a picture of the law and practice of Jewish life in all phases, excepting those laws and regulations not applicable in a diaspora. He has attempted to present standard Judaism rather than any one type. An introduction answers the question, What is Judaism? Part I describes the institutions of Judaism (Sabbath, the festivals, prayer, etc.) and Part II presents the principal views of Judaism. A glossary of Jewish terms is added at the end. It is a useful handbook, covering both practice and doctrine.

H. G.

An Outline Life of Christ. By Frank E. Wilson and Clifford P. Morehouse. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1947, pp. xii + 147. $.60.

An outline of the life of Christ begun by the late Frank E. Wilson and finished by Clifford P. Morehouse to complete the Outline Series prepared by the late Bishop of Eau Claire. It provides, in addition to a narrative of the ministry of the Lord, chapters on the pagan world and the Jewish world, and one on the Gospel sources which follows the treatment of Goodspeed in his *Introduction to the New Testament.*

H. G.

St. Peter Damian: His teaching on the spiritual life. By Owen J. Blum. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1947, pp. viii + 224.

This is volume ten in the New Series of studies in medieval history published by the Catholic University. It studies the eleventh century saint and reformer with regard to his religious convictions, attempting to remedy the oversight of his teaching on the spiritual life that has resulted from an emphasis on him as reformer.

H. G.

Hê Stenographia par' Archaiois kai Neôterois êtoi Historia tês Sêmeiographias. By James Chr. Christodoulou. Alexandria: Press of the Patriarchate, 1939, pp. 32.

This is an interesting, if brief, account of ancient stenography, with citation of the evidence from classical authors and from Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV, No. 274. The book is a good introduction to the study of the subject.

F. C. G.

The Message of Romans: An Exposition. By Robert C. McQuilkin. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1947, pp. 178. $2.00.

This is an exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, intended for classroom use. It is descriptive rather than critical, really an extended paraphrase of the Epistle, with illustrative material usually from missionary life, and written from a very conservative point of view.

H. G.

Les Vies de Jésus et le Jésus de l'Histoire. By Jean G. H. Hoffmann. (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis edenda curavit A. Fridrichsen, XVII.) Paris X: Messageries Évangéliques, 20 rue de Paradis, 1947, pp. vi + 233. Swedish Kroner 8.

This is a study of the historical value of the various lives of Jesus published in France between Renan's *Vie de Jésus* (1863) and Charles Guignebert's *Jésus* (1933), exclusive of Catholic works. It is a very capable survey, with good critical observations on the various books and their authors; it is especially good on Henri Monnier—who deserved far more recognition than he ever received from the world of Protestant scholarship—and also on Maurice Goguel, whose New Testament work really dominates the whole realm of present-day French Protestant biblical studies. At the end of the book the problems involved in historical research in the Life of Christ are clearly stated, and the possible methods, including Form Criticism. The limitations of the Gospels as sources for the biography of our Lord are fully recognized.

F. C. G.

Épicure et ses Dieux. By A.-J. Festugière. Presses universitaires de France, 1946. 90 fr.

This little book is the latest in the series, Mythes et Religions; it is one of the clearest and fairest ever written on the founder of Epicureanism. Epicurus was, it is now recognized, no mere hedonistic devotee of pleasure, but a serious and high-minded philosopher. Considering what religion amounted to in his time and place, many of us might have been Epicureans too, had we lived then! Fr. Festugière is one of our best experts on Hellenism, and his opening chapter (on the religious situation at the end of the classical age) is worth the price of the book—several times over!

F. C. G.

La Riqueza de las Bibliotecas Pertenecientes a la Iglesia en Códices al Sobrevenir la Segunda Guerra Mundial. By Enrique Sparn. Cordoba (Rep. Argentina): Imprenta de la Universidad, 1946, pp. 75.

La Riqueza de las Iglesias Cristianas en Bibliotecas al Sobrevenir la Segunda Guerra Mundial. Part III: Las Iglesias Evangélica y Ortodoxa. By Enrique Sparn. Ib., pp. 95.

These are brief, well-printed, illustrated surveys of the world's library resources as relating to Christianity, and of the library resources of the churches. The books are evidently designed to guide South American students in their use of the world's theological collections. As such, brief as they are, they will be most useful. It may convey a false impression, however, to list the denominational libraries by themselves and then the Seminarios Protestantes no Ecclesiasticos," where Union and Seabury-Western and Nashotah are listed, along with Andover-Newton and the Pacific School of Religion. It is a question which of these institutions would be the first to protest at being classified as "non-ecclesiastical"!

F. C. G.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Ed. by Gerhard Kittel. Bd. V. Lfg. 1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, Dec. 1944, pp. 64. RM 2.90.

This is the Lieferung with which THWB came to a stop, though many of us (the undersigned included) never received more than half of Vol. IV—and now we learn that the remaining copies of the latter half of Vol. IV were destroyed by fire during the War and must be reprinted. It is reported that the Word Book is to be continued, as soon as satisfactory arrangements for publication can be completed; this is good news, for the work is really indispensable to every serious student of the N.T., regardless of his theology (or that of the THWB!). One can learn from this vast accumulation of material, even though one may disagree at points with the interpretation placed upon it.

The present installment contains three important articles, and part of a fourth: *xenos, xenia,* etc.; *xulon; ogkos* (one page); and the first part of *hodos,* etc. One could really write the history of Greek ethics—or of a major part of Greek ethics—from the point of view of the place which hospitality held in Greek life; the same holds for Semitic (or biblical) ethics; while the place of hospitality in Christian ethics is of course extremely important (though some Christians may not be aware of it!). In fact, after reading this article one feels impelled to write a sermon on the subject: the THWB is by no means a tool of dry-as-dust research students only, but has the meat for many a good lecture or sermon, if one will only read—and think as he reads!

Hodos opens up one of the profoundest ethical conceptions in Jewish and early Christian thought; the article begins with the Fable of Prodicus (i.e. the Choice of Heracles), which must lie back (perhaps a long way back) of the popular idea of the "Two Ways." Only 22 pages of the article appear in this installment, and we must wait—hopefully!—for the appearance of the next Lieferung and the continuation of the Dictionary for the rest of this very important treatment.

F. C. G.

Prayers for Young People. By Abigail Ackr Johnson. Westminster Press, 1947, $1.50.

Leaders of teen-age youth, as well as the young people themselves, will welcome this collection of prayers, written by a young woman who understands the difficulties involved in learning to pray.

The book is divided into individual and group prayers, and each prayer is preceded by a passage of Scripture, which greatly enhances the devotional character of the whole collection. As the author says in the Introduction, "We cannot very well speak with God unless we listen to him." The prayers are natural and spontaneous expressions of the interests, problems, and experiences of young people and could well be used at the college age as well as in younger groups. It is undoubtedly the best collection of its kind which has appeared in recent years.

M. H.